

The XXIV Cases
CONCERNING
THINGS INDIFFERENT
IN

Religious Worship

Considered.

OR THE

RESOLVER

Better Resolved by his own Principles ;

AND

NON-CONFORMISTS

More Confirmed.

ALSO THE

GRAND CASE

Touching Ministers Conformity, with the double
Supplement thereunto Annexed, Briefly Discussed.

Rom. 15. 22.

Edward Bagshaw.

Happy is he that condemneth not himself, in that thing which he Alloweth.

And,

Happy is he that alloweth not himself, in that thing which he Condemneth.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1663.

Sharp Coll.

Second pt. of "The great questions concerning things indifferent, &c."
Third pt. had another name.

W. H. L. & Co.
100 N. 1st St.

1875

LONDON, ENGLAND

Question.

Whether Things Inexpedient, or purely Indifferent (such as our (English) Ceremonies are) may be Imposed by men lawfully in the Worship of God? Or, if Imposed, may lawfully be submitted, assented, and consented unto?

THis Grand Question hath three Heads of Dispute; Of the Lawfulness 1. Of the Imposition of them in Worship. 2. Of Submission to them as to Practice. 3. Of the Declaration of an *Unfeigned Assent and Consent* to all and every thing contained in, and prescribed by the *Book of Common Prayer*, or by the *Late Act of Uniformity in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline*. The Probleme hath respect only or chiefly to Worship, and to the Decision of it, I shall do these three things. 1. Explain the Terms. 2. Shew how far the Dissenting Parties agree. 3. Undertake to prove the Negative in all the Particulars, upon the Casuists own Principles and Concessions.

I. *Explication of the Terms.*

1. *Ceremonies.*] I begin with this, partly to distinguish between Ceremonies, and Circumstances of Worship, which commonly in this Dispute are confounded; and partly to draw down the Question *a Thesi*, as discoursed in general under the Notion of Things *Inexpedient*, and purely Indifferent (as it is warily done by the Rev. *Casuist*, and others, which affords them some Creep holes, and Liberty of Evasion) *ad Hypothesin* in special to our Ceremonies, of which the Controversie is. And the Definition of a Ceremony will clearly difference it from a Circumstance of Worship. Every Ceremony may be considered as a circumstance, but every circumstance in, or of Worship is not a Ceremony. A Ceremony is a circumstance, and something more. And a circumstance may be made a Ceremony: *ex. gr.* The colour of a Beast offered in Sacrifice was a circumstance in it self: But in the Heifer of Expiation,

on, the colour was specified, and required to be Red, and no other: Here a circumstance is made, more then naturally it was, a Ceremony. Say the same of *Time, Place, Habit, &c.* abstractedly considered they were but circumstances of Worship, but determined or instituted by God were made Ceremonies, as were the *Jewish* Festivals, Temple, Ephod, &c. As for the Definition of a Ceremony (for a circumstance is nothing but an Adjunct of any other thing, substance or action) it is variously given by divers Divines; but all for the most part agree in this (even Heathens also in any Religion). [“ That a Ceremony in Religion is a sacred Rite instituted for the honouring of God in his Publick Worship, and “ indeed a part of external Worship.] The *Casnist* calls them [Sacred mystical Ceremonies, significant symbolical Rites, *Pag.* 145.] Others call them *Ritus colendi Deum*; not only circumstantial Rites to attend the Worship, but Rites of Worship: or Ceremonial, Ritual Worship: that is, parts of Worship; for worship is divided into Moral and Ceremonial; which Distinction is idle and vain, if Ceremonies be not worship or parts of worship. The Learned *Casnist* (and others) fearing this may fall foul upon our Ceremonies, have confounded Ceremonies with circumstances, or at least have equivocally used the words: For *Pag.* 6. He speaks [of circumstances properly so called, as time, place, habit, purely indifferent] in a general consideration abstractedly from Inconveniency; But he knowes that those circumstances determined by God were made also Ceremonies: Institution Divine made this alteration in, or gave this addition to them: And will not humane Institution also of *Sacred, mystical, symbolical, significant* Rites do the same? That shall be tried hereafter. But in another place, *Pag.* 145. speaking of such Ceremonies, he confounds, or darkens the sense by a Distinction: To this effect: [Ceremonies may be appointed to signify the Favour of God, or the Grace of the Sacraments, or to be a means of receiving any Blessing from God, and this is very dangerous, if corrupt and superstitious men at any time rule the Church, &c.---But if by Rights and Ceremonies we mean only the circumstances of Divine worship, and by significancy that they are fitted to commend the Exercise, with Order and Decency to express the Gravity and Devotion of the worshippers, I cannot discover so much danger.] But 1. Should not men speak Properly in such a controversie as this, distinguishing Ceremonies

Ceremonies from circumstances? Do any that would be understood, call meer circumstances of Order, &c. Ceremonies? Are not natural and civil circumstances so far significant, to express gravity and devotion, and tend to Edification, and yet no sacred Ceremonies? 2. Though our Ceremonies do not signifie immediately the favour of God, or the Grace of the Sacraments; yet do they signifie Duties on our part, Purity, Constancy, Humility: and unless they be idle and vain, (and for that cause be cast out of Worship) they are intended to be a means of receiving some Blessing from God, by a moral operation of those Graces and Duties intended to be signified in their Institution: And this will easily multiply their number, and in his Judgment render them dangerous, till (as he saith) they become stench in the Nostrils of God, and of all sober and stayd men] As in the Church of Rome. More of this hereafter.

2. *Inexpedient things.*] This word had need to be explained; for it may have a double sense. 1. Privatively, it is as much as *not expedient*: and so is the same almost with those things the *Casuists* call *purely Indifferent* (of which in the next place) and often call them Inconvenient. 2. Positively, as directly contrary to expedient, which signifies things *useful, helpful* in worship, or to the worship. He gives us this notion of them, when he saies, p. 49. [Ceremonies of the Church ought to be *expedient* not *hurtful* to the Church, not troublesom to good Consciences, not burdensom] Things inexpedient therefore in worship are such as are hurtful to the worship or worshippers, troublesom, burdensom, in a word, any things that violate those 7 Rules required in the Imposition of Indifferent things in worship, *Cas. 8. p. 33.* And in this sense I think the Rev. *Casnist* doth, or should understand the word *Inexpedient*; as a degree worse then purely-indifferent (which also for their uselessness in worship are unlawfully imposed by the Church or Magistrate, as we shall hear him assert anon) But yet (which is observable) in the process of his Discourse he confounds things inexpedient with things meerly or privatively inconvenient, or unfit: The Instances are many, [Pag. 80. Inconvenience and inexpediency, Pag. 81. Any thing unfit and Inconvenient. Pag. 89. Inconvenience only. Pag. 91. An Inexpedient indifferent thing. Pag. 109. Somewhat inexpedient, barely inexpedient. Pag. 105.] But (under favour) this is either a tergiversation, or perverting

ting of the Question ; especially in respect of the second part, our submission to them : for though it be true that some things inconvenient ought not to be imposed in worship, yet such things if imposed, may in some cases be lawfully submitted to, and in that No. ion have been submitted to, by some Learned and Pious Non-conformists : For the Inconvenience may be only in a circumstance of Worship, as at an unseasonable time, or inconvenient place, and the like. And if no other will be allowed, submission to them may be lawful, rather than not to enjoy the publick Ordinances. But if inexpedient as Ceremonies, *i. e.*, hurtful to the Worship as before ; the Question is altered, and some new Distinctions must be used. of which more perhaps hereafter.

3. *Things purely indifferent*]. What is meant by things Indifferent, he resolved us in his first Case. A middle between necessary, as commanded, & unlawful things, as forbidden ; morally neither good nor bad in themselves, but may be either by some circumstance : And these seem to some to be of two sorts. 1. Such as may by some circumstance be made good or bad. 2. Such as when used in Worship, are at least not good : (whether not bad is a Question if Imposed and used in Worship) These our *Casuists* call purely Indifferent, others meerly Indifferent ; or *quatenus Indifferent*. Case 6. What those purely indifferent things are, he discovers not, either by a description of them, or any one Instance in particular. Indeed at Case 12. He gives us the same description of a thing Indifferent (as at first) and applies it to a thing purely indifferent. [A middle place it holds between things *necessary* and things *sinful* ; between things expedient, and things inexpedient, &c. but in all regards purely indifferent.] And then tells us, [The Question is not whether there be any such things or no, but *hoc supposito*, that such things there are, and that they are commanded by Lawful Authority] But did it not concern him to give one Instance of such a thing as is *purely Indifferent*, not in its Nature and in it self, for there are enough in that kind, but when Imposed in Worship? That's the Case and Question : [What's to be done by private persons, when things purely indifferent are required in Religious Exercises?] Now if there be no such things as purely Indifferent in worship, the Case is vain and idle : Speak Sir, to our Ceremonies : Are our Ceremonies, as the *Surplice*, or *Cross* in Baptism, a thing purely Indifferent in worship? You durst not say so ; for that

that had reflected upon the Church imposing, as a crime, you having formerly affirmed it unlawful to impose such things upon several good Reasons, *Case 6*. Therefore you had rather suppose such a case should be, then propose an Instance when it is so: *Cautè si non castè*. But Sir, by things purely Indifferent, my self, and some Readers understood you to mean things that were no way useful in worship, but like *Herb. John* in the Pot; if they do no good, they do no harm, as differencing them from things *Inexpedient*, as *less evil*. And this at last you give us to be the sense, but when you thought this question and your former sense of it, *Case 12*. was forgotten, see *Pag. 147*. your own true description of a thing purely indifferent, *viz.* [as to be of no use or service] that is, in worship. Affirming [nothing so purely indifferent ought to be imposed.] And in this sense I take a thing purely indifferent in worship is a thing useless, needless, unnecessary, &c. And in this notion if you do not take it, you will never fully resolve the present Controversie. As on the other side, if you take inexpedient only privatively, for not useful, or only inconvenient and unfit, your Cases are coincident, if not the same; this of purely indifferent, and that of things inexpedient. But I pass on in my Explication.

4. *May be imposed lawfully by men*] This deserves to be explained a little. 1. To manifest where the Poyson lies of most of humane Traditions applied to worship, *viz.* in the *Imposers*, sometimes, only; alwaies, chiefly. For their Imposition entrenches most upon the Wisdom, and Sovereignty of God; and the Kingly Office of Christ, in appointing waies and meanes of his worship. 2. To distinguish between the Imposers and Submitters in point of Lawfulness. For some inconvenient things may lawfully be submitted to, if they be imposed, which may not but sinfully be imposed. As if a meer circumstance unfit or inconvenient (in the *Casuits* language) be commanded in worship, without the Observation whereof, there can be no publick worship, it's granted by him to be unlawful to command such a circumstance, but strongly pleaded to be lawful and expedient to obey it. 3. I adde, *By men.*] For God may by his Sovereignty command what indifferent, or to us seeming inconvenient things in worship, he pleases (as water in Baptism to signifie and operate the Grace of Regeneration) because he hath power to work Grace by any means: but men as they have

have no Authority to institute any *means* of Worship, so neither have they power to render them effectual to them that use them.

5. *In the Worship of God.*] For in civil things ther's a Latitude or Liberty both to Superiours to impose things inconvenient, or inexpedient, both privatively, if not unfit; or positively, as hurtful; and for people to obey, without sin: but not so generally in Worship: for there both may sin, the one in commanding, the other in submitting to unlawful things. Unlawful, I say, either in their own nature, or by some Accident or circumstance becoming sinful in Worship. Of which hereafter more.

6. *Or, if Imposed, may lawfully be submitted to.*] This brings us to the second question. concerning Submission to things inexpedient, or purely indifferent in Worship. For 1. That they may not lawfully be imposed, is asserted often by the *Casnist*. The submission to them is now considerable. 2. This submission may respect either the Minister who is to act them, by active obedience, or the People, who in some things are, or may be only passively obedient, by presence at them, when they are done without any assent or consent unto them, yea with manifested dissent from, and dislike of them. Of which in another Place and Time.

7. *Assented and Consented unto.*] And this leads us to the third and last question. We have thus proceeded. 1. That some things inconvenient may not be imposed in Worship. 2. That yet some such things, if imposed, may be barely submitted to, and also lawfully in a Case. 3. We are now to go the last step, whether they may be submitted to with an unfeigned assent and consent? The Explication is only here intended in three words. 1. *Assent*] hath respect to the *truth* of a thing, and is an act of the *Understanding*. 2. *Consent*] is an Act of the Will respecting the *Goodness* of a thing. 3. *Unfeigned*] implies the sincerity and fulness of that Assent and Consent from the bottom of the heart. The Terms of the question being thus explained, we proceed to the Second thing propounded. How far Parties agree.

II. *Postulata, five Concessa.*

1. Things used (or to be used) in Worship, are of three sorts: *Necessary, Unlawful, or of a middle sort, of themselves neither good*

good nor bad, but made so by circumstances, called things Indifferent.

1. *Necessary*, as commanded by God: and they are of two sorts. In special, as the particular Ordinances, the word and Sacraments. Or in general, as the necessary circumstances tending to Decency, Order and Edification, 1 Cor. 14. 40. This Distinction is given us by the *Casnist* in a little other terms, *Case* 12. *Pag.* 67. A thing is necessary either properly as expressly commanded by God, or occasionally, as expedient.] that is, with respect to the Rule of circumstances, and so generally commanded also. Things expedient then are Necessary in Worship by an occasional or secondary Necessity; let that be remembered.

2. *Unlawful* or sinful, from some Prohibition from God, and that (as was said in the former) either in special, as forbidden by express words, as Images in the Second Commandment: or in general and by consequence, as all Imaginations and Inventions of men added to divine worship, which are prohibited in the negative part of the same Commandment: and also such Circumstances as are indecent, unorderedly, and against Edification in the Negative part of that Precept, 1 Cor. 14. 40. This Distinction is owned and given us also by the *Casnist* in the same place, *Pag.* 68. A thing may be sinful either in it self, (that is, in its own Nature, as directly prohibited by God) or by some inconvenience in its use.] that is, when it is Inexpedient to be used in Worship; Inexpedient as to the use, as he expressed himself there, *pag.* 66. Things Inexpedient then, as violating Order, Decency, &c. are unlawful in Worship: Let this be remembered also against anon.

3. *Indifferent*, of a middle sort in themselves neither good nor bad, as morally considered, or in their own Nature, but by circumstances they may become good or bad: or to use his own words [very apt by reason of Circumstances to tend unto, to swerve unto, to become, or appear, either good or bad.] Now what those Circumstances are that change them into good or bad, he doth not thereby tell us (as he ought to have done) but yet we may collect his sense or meaning, by what is already said, (and more hereafter:) viz. they then become good, (yea necessary) when they are expedient for Decency, Order, &c. and Bad, i. e. sinful when they are inconvenient, or inexpedient for those ends, that is hurtful in their use.

For

For a Close of the first Concession, I shall only take and give notice of the *Method* of the *Casnist*. In the former part treating of the *Imposition* of things in Worship, he only denies the power to impose things, purely Indifferent, and Inexpedient, (supposing indeed that as Necessary things are commanded by God and Imposed : so sinful things may not be Imposed by man.) but saies nothing of things *doubtful* or *significant*, &c But in the latter part, of *Submission*, he instances in, and puts five Cases, what is to be done, if such things be imposed, viz. 1. Necessary things. 2. Expedient. 3. Purely Indifferent. 4. Inexpedient. 5. Sinful. In which Proceeding this is further observable, that he misleads himself and his Reader by this gradation : as if all the 4 former were sinless and lawful, and the last sort only sinful in Worship. But it already appears (by what hath already been said, and will do more hereafter) that as the two first sorts are only lawful in Worship, So the three last are all unlawful there ; either in themselves, as those he calls sinful, or by the Inconvenience of their use, as the third and fourth. And so stealing (in this Mist) this Opinion, that things purely Indifferent or Inexpedient, without the former Distinction, are lawful in Worship : His Arguments for Submission seem so Rational and Plausible, taken from *Peace*, *Duty*, *Safety*. In a word, as he mistakes, so he mis-states the question, disputing for Submission to things lawful in themselves : when he should prove things Inconvenient in their use, in Worship, may lawfully be submitted to. This Observation being remembered we thankfully accept this first Concession, and proceed to the next.

2. Nothing sinful or unlawful, may be either Imposed or submitted unto in Divine Worship. 1. Not Imposed : This needs no Proof, as confessed by all, that know what Religion is, and the Worship of God means. But we have the Assent and Consent of our Rev. *Casnist*, often attested in this Point. For putting the Case, what is to be done, when things sinful are Imposed, he deprecates any [mistake of being an Advocate for sin or sinful Impositions.] And presently after resolves, [such Impositions are not to be obeyed,] and if not obeyed, to what end are they Imposed ? Yea when he resolved before, that things purely Indifferent and Inexpedient cannot lawfully be Imposed in Worship, much more will he deny things sinful to be lawfully Imposed. 2. Not Submitted

mitted to if Imposed. This is the Resolution of the Case, *Pag. 119.* peremptorily from the Authority of *St. August.* and *Bernard.* [Things of themselves and materially evil, as they cannot justly be commanded, so they cannot lawfully be done.] Yea in another Case. [What if they seem sinful to us, though lawful in themselves, if after sincere and serious disquisition they seem still sinful to us?] He peremptorily concludes we must not obey, *pag. 126.* Much less if it be sinful in it self. But seeing some things are sinful, not materially or in themselves, but in their use, what will he resolve in the latter case? Whether may such things be Imposed in Worship: or if Imposed, be submitted to? The Resolution of this fully and clearly would have put an end to the present Controversie; But he either waves it, or obscures it. Yet something shall be said to it in the next Concession.

3. No Inexpedient thing may lawfully be imposed in worship, or submitted to. 1. Not imposed: this is fully yielded us, *pag. 36. Case 8.* [It being against the Rule of the Apostle, (*all things are not expedient*) and indeed against common Reason; it is not lawful in Church-Governours to impose any thing about Gods worship that is only Indifferent, and lawful in its self, but not expedient.] Had he given us his Reasons against Imposition of such things in worship (as he doth in things purely Indifferent) he had done noble service to the Church; yet something he hinted in the words alledged [Its against the Apostles Rule, and common Reason to impose such things,] and more explicitly in the words afore these immediately [All things that are Indifferent and not expedient, are not lawful, but sinful] Sinful! Surely he must not mean materially and in themselves (for they were not then indifferent) but sinful in their use if Imposed or used in Worship: that is, because they are 'nexpedient, yea hurtful to the Worship, against Order, &c. and to the Worshipers too often. In a word, against the Second Commandment. 2 Not submitted to. For this we have his Assent also. [*Things not expedient to be done*] ought not to be done, and things not expedient to be commanded, ought not to be commanded.] Where we have both asserted. They ought not to be imposed, or if imposed, not submitted to. If he, or any for him shall say (as some for him do say) things not expedient, if left free to our choyce, may not be done, but if commanded, that alters the Case. I Answer (though I think he intended not

C

this

See *pag. 69.*
There's a pre-
obligation up-
on Authority
to Impose no-
thing but what
is expedient in
the Worship of
God, and *p. 73.*
admits the ex-
ercising of pow-
er in requiring
of things that
are lawful, but
inexpedient, to
be unwarrant-
able, as an a-
buse of Autho-
rity.

this hidden sense in this place) 1. He hath asserted that [things not expedient (in worship) are not lawful, but sinful] as afore. And can the Command of Authority make that lawful which, if not in it self, yet in its use is sinful? 2. It is acknowledged by a Profelyte, and stout Advocate of the *Casnist*, [That if the things be sinful, they may neither be lawfully Imposed nor Submitted to.] I see his Evasion: He meanes if they be sinful in themselves, or in their Nature, and not if only sinfully commanded. But I rejoyn. Things may be sinful in their *Use* as inexpedient (as was said and granted by his Freind, *supra* Concession. 1.) and will he, dare he affirm, that things either way sinful, may be either imposed, or practised in Worship? I believe he will not upon second and serious Consideration.

See Pag. 147.
Nothing purely indifferent ought to be Imposed, as all moderate men allow.

4. Nothing purely Indifferent (that is idle, or of no use) in worship, may be imposed in worship, or if imposed, submitted to in Practise. 1. Not imposed, that's granted, and asserted often. First, he hath a case wholly against it, *Case 6*. Where, by several Arguments he confutes that Opinion; some whereof are taken from the gross *Absurdities* which would follow if such a power were granted to Church-Governours. All *a posteriori*, only the last *a priori*. God hath not invested them with such a power, which though I grant to be true, some of his good Friends will not allow him: For they say God hath not only given allowance, but a Command to the Church-Rulers, to ordain Ceremonies for Order and Decency, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. Yes, may he say, but not what indifferent things they please. But according to the Rules of Imposition in the Scripture: that they be few and wholsom, expedient, &c. But I pray who shall be Judge of their Impositions? If themselves only in their Prudence and Discretion, they may impose what, and as many as they please. And though the Rev. *Casnist* saies, pag. 28. [he never met with any high Conformist that allowed them such a power,] yet sure he forgot himself. For a few Leaves after, pag. 36. he brings in the great and famous Defender of this Church, confidently, and expressly asserting such a Power. [“ Church-Governours (saith he) have liberty to establish whatsoever being in it self indifferent, shall to their wisdom seem most expedient.”] But let that pass. How doth he prove [that God hath not invested them with such an Arbitrary and strangely unlimited power?] Not a word to prove it, which concerned him.

to have done; seeing others affirm, that he hath such a Power. One Argument *a priori*, from the Prohibition of God, had done the deed. That was, the sinfulness of such things in Worship. Why? Because they are either against the Apostles Rule, (they are against (or not according to) Order, Decency, or Edification. Jor against the Third Commandment of the first Table, (the general Rule of worship) as idle, useless, superfluous, and consequently a taking of Gods Name in vain. Again he tells us, what he had told us before, that [such things, *viz.* purely Indifferent. ought not to be enjoined by Authority.] 2. But what if they be Imposed? May they be submitted to by Ministers, or People? For this, he is as peremptory for the Affirmative, as he was before for the Negative. [“When a thing is once required, though not expedient as we would desire (here he calls things purely indifferent not Expedient) we are under an obligation, and we must not consult our Liberty, but our Duty. Not so much our liberty to forbear, as our liberty to obey, &c. pag. 69.] And presently endeavours to prove this his Assertion [“By three things of so great concern, and even indispensable conveniency, that the ordinary inconveniency of any lawful thing enjoined, seems very light and inconsiderable, &c. pag. 90 and they are Peace, Duty, Safety.] But (let it be observed) This he could not affirm, till first he had changed the state of the Question: which was of things not expedient, or Inexpedient, turning the sense into Unfit and Inconvenient. And 2. Pittifully begged the question; that the things specified, (whether purely indifferent, or inexpedient) are lawful in Worship. He must not mean lawful in themselves, or in their nature, but also in their use in worship. For this Distinction he gave us, (and we shall hold him to it) in the first Concession: [“A thing may be sinful either in it self, or by the inconveniency of its use] that is, when it is inexpedient to be used in worship. A thing therefore may be lawful in it self, out of worship; which may be sinful by the inconvenience of its use, if used in worship. And upon this gross (I say not prevarication, for I judge reverently of the *Casnist*, he intended not to pervert the state of the question, but) mistake or slip of his Judgment or Memory, the whole following Discourse is founded. He supposes (and it hath misled too many) that because the things are lawful in themselves, abstracted from worship, therefore though inconvenient in worship; they

may be lawfully obeyed in worship, and yet sinfully imposed. And this Mistake I confess he might the more easily fall upon, by the non-observation of a double Distinction, useful to the decision of this Controversie. 1. Between the Nature of the things inconvenient imposed in worship. They are either meer Circumstances, or more even Religious Ceremonies; If the first be imposed (though sinfully by Authority) rather than lose the substance of Worship, the Ordinances of God, they may, yea must be submitted to, and obeyed. But if they be Sacred Ceremonies of humane Invention, and Institution, they may not (I yet think) be obeyed; at least, that's the question. 2. Ther's another Distinction to be observ'd between Active and Passive Obedience, when such things are imposed. It may be lawful (as I yet suppose, to prevent separation from a Church) to yield Passive Obedience, by presence at the Ordinances, when not to be had without them, having shewed our dislike and dissent. But the question is of Active Obedience in acting those Impositions, which involves our assent and consent, either unfeigned or hypocritical. But I return to the Rev. *Casulist*. And had he not in his Title Page, limited his Discourse to *Religious* Matters, that is, Matters of Divine worship, I should have suggested another Distinction, between Civil and Sacred Affairs, with respect to the power of Superiours in both of these. It may give a little light to the business in hand, and therefore I shall briefly touch it. In civil affairs the supreme Authority may impose some things inconvenient, or inexpedient, that is perhaps hurtful to the business, and to the Subjects or Inferiours, and must also be obeyed; But in Religion and Worship, as he may impose nothing inexpedient (as is granted above) so if he doth impose such things in worship (with the Limitations and former Distinctions) he is not to be obeyed. And this I shall briefly make good against him by his own Principles, and Concessions, and other Reasons. 1. No sinful or unlawful thing may be (imposed or) submitted to in worship: but things inconvenient in their use, are sinful: See the first Concession, *Paragr. 2.* ["A thing may be sinful either in it self, or by the inconvenience of its use, p 68."] Therefore they may not be submitted to. 2 No inexpedient thing may be (imposed or) submitted to in worship: This is yielded in the third Concession; and the Reason is, because they are sinful. So he affirmed afore, *pag. 35, 36.* ["All things that are in-
different,

“different, and not expedient, are not lawful but sinful.] But things purely indifferent are inexpedient in worship. This is also his own Expression, now he is speaking of things purely indifferent, to call them inconvenient, not expedient; And surely he will not deny but purely Indifferent things imposed in worship, are inconvenient in their use, and not expedient or inexpedient. (If he take these terms for the same) therefore not to be submitted to.

3. No things that cause the submitter to them, to prophane the worship of God, by taking his Name in vain, against the Third Commandment, are to be submitted to, though they be imposed; this cannot with any Reason be denied: But purely indifferent things, that is, (by his own Exposition) such as are of no use in Service or worship, but idle, useless, superfluous, (perhaps ridiculous) do prophane the Worship of God, therefore they are not to be submitted to.

4. Nothing that violates the Rule of the Apostle concerning Order, Decency and Edification, 1 Cor. 14.40. ought to be imposed, or if imposed, submitted to; That such things may not be imposed, is asserted strongly, pag. 43. [“Nothing that is disorderly, indecent, (or against Edification in Gods Worship, can warrantably be imposed upon the Church.] But things purely indifferent (described as afore) are indecent, disorderly, and unedifying in Worship; ergo not to be imposed, and for the same reason to be submitted to, because they are sinful against the Apostles Precept: Much more might be added, but I forbear till we come to the *Hypothesis* in our Ceremonies. I have been large in this, I shall be shorter in the next Concessions.

5. Nothing really superstitious may be imposed in worship, or if imposed, submitted to. 1. Not imposed: For that's a manifest injury to, and violation (as of the whole first Table of the Decalogue in general, so) of the Second Commandment thereof in special, which forbids all superstitious Worship, as false. Our Rev. *Casuit* speaks not expressly of this Case, in regard of the Imposition of such things; but comprehends it (as I suppose) under the general of things sinful and unlawful, and that is enough against the Imposition of them. 2. And as for submission to them, he seems to grant that if the things be proved to be really such (as by some they are supposed to be) they need not, they ought not to be submitted to. To discover his Judgment herein he puts a case

case [wherein doth Superstition, or the appearance thereof consist? pag. 129. And he reduces all to 4 Heads. 1. *Merit*. 2. *Worship*. 3. *Perfection*. 4. *Necessity*] Whether all the kinds of Superstition fall under these 4 heads, I am not fully satisfied: But he seems to me to grant, that if they be truly and really superstitious, we may lawfully disobey the Imposition of them. But of this more in *Hypothesi*.

6. Nothing doubtful or suspicious of sinfulness ought to be imposed in worship, or if imposed, submitted to. For the Imposition of such things in the worship of God the Rev. *Casnist* saies nothing, or but little directly, as not making it a disputable Case; only by consequence he saies something to it in another Case. [What is to be done when a thing seems sinful to us?] And he seems to resolve it negatively, we ought not to submit unto it. For pag. 124. He thus bespeakes his private person. [If thy disquisition for satisfaction, hath brought thee to this, that thou art in a doubt, whether thou maist obey or no, first I recommend thee to that excellent *Casnist*, the Rev. B. of *Lincolne*] But what if he satisfie him not; then hear his own Resolution, pag. 126. [If the thing required appear sinful to thee still, thou art bound by the Law, thou art bound to the peace of thine own Conscience, — Thou maist not obey.] Thence would I infer if in doubtful things, I am not bound to obey (for if I doubt, and do a thing, especially in worship, I sin) the Magistrate seems pre-obliged not to command such things: For to what end, if the doubtful need not, must not obey him? But of this also more in *Hypothesi*.

7. No part of worship may be imposed in Divine Service by men. The Reason is given by the Rev. *Casnist* twice, because it is superstitious; once p. 4. and 130. Adding, It's Gods Prerogative alone to prescribe his own Worship; *Command*. 2. and forbidden to men in the Negative part thereof.

8. No significant thing (or Ceremony) may by men be imposed in Worship.] The Rev. *Casnist*, having propounded this case, p. 144. [Whether the imputing of significancy to things imposed render them superstitious?] Resolves the Case by a double or rather treble Distinction. 1. Of Ceremonies from Circumstances of Worship. 2. Of the Authors or Institutors of Worship, God or Men. 3. Of Significancy, to signifie either the Favour of God, the Grace of the Sacraments, or to be a meanes of receiving any Blessing

Blessing from God, or to intend only fitness to commend the exercise with Order and Decency, and to express the gravity and devotion of the Worshippers, &c.] The Result is this, That *Ceremonies* (not meer Circumstances) instituted by men (not God) signifying the Favour of God, &c. (not Order, Decency, Gravity) are very dangerous, if corrupt and superstitious men should at any time rule the Church: and we may have quickly not 7, but 70 times 7 if not entire, yet Semi-Sacraments, the Church of God and his Service being thereby obnoxious to all the antick and conceited Crotchets that the vain imaginations of over-curious men can cumber them with, till they become stench in the Nostrils of all sober and stayd men, and of God himself, as with the Church of *Rome*.] This is enough to decide the Controversie in hand, if justly applicable to our Ceremonies. To the Consideration whereof we now proceed.

III. *The Proof of the Negative in all the Particulars.*

Hitherto following the steps of the Rev. *Casnist*, I have proceeded only in *Thesi*, concerning things Inexpedient, or purely Indifferent, whether they may be imposed, or if imposed, submitted to in worship; and have gathered his Concessions into one view, and shewed how far both Parties agree: We are now come to the Application of these Concessions in *Hypothesi*, to the Matters of our bitter Contentions at this day: And much of my work is done already. The Propositions being granted me, and proved, I shall need only to prove the *Assumptions* of all my Syllogismes:

For if our Ceremonies prove such things, as the Concessions grant, the Conclusions will easily follow, that they are unlawful, to be either Imposed in Worship, or Submitted to: I shall now therefore state the Question anew in our particular Case, thus:

Whether our Ceremonies may lawfully by men be Imposed in the Worship of God: or, if Imposed, may lawfully be Submitted, Assented and Consented unto?

The Explication of the Terms is laid down in the beginning, and the Probleme contains 3 questions, viz. Of the Lawfulness 1. Of the

the Imposition of them in worship. 2. Of the Submission to them. 3. Of the Declaration of an unfeigned Assent and Consent unto them. To the Particulars.

I. *Of the Imposition of Ceremonies.*

What we, and most Learned Divines understand by a Ceremony imposed in worship, was discoursed in the Explicatory part at the Entrance of this Dissertation, *viz.* a Sacred Rite of worshipping God intended and instituted to the honouring God in worship; whereby it is contra-distinguished to a meer Circumstance of Worship, tending to Decency, Order and Edification. Now that such Ceremonies may not be Imposed, the Rev. *Casnist* doth not explicitly assert (that had been dangerous to himself) but yet implicitly insinuates so much: [If Ceremonies significant of the Grace and Favour of God, or to be a means of receiving any Blessing from God be imposed, there is, no doubt, (saies he) much danger in it, p 145.] But what if meer Circumstances be imposed? But of this more in that Head of *Significancy*.

That it is unlawful for the Church or Magistrate to impose our Ceremonies, will appear by Application of all or most of the Concessions above, given us by the Reverend *Casnist* himself; In General thus. No sinful, unlawful thing may by any sort of men be imposed in worship. This is yielded by all of any Religion, as at Concession 2. But I assume, our Ceremonies imposed are sinful and unlawful; *ergo* they ought not to be imposed in Worship: The Assumption is proved by the special Concessions.

I. [All things imposed or used in Worship, are either necessary or unlawful; and so either Good or Bad: But our Ceremonies are not necessary; *ergo*.

The *Minor* is constantly and frequently affirmed by the Advocates thereof. God was, is, and may be well, yea better served without them.

The *Major* is granted in the first Concession. Necessary as commanded by God; specially, or generally. Unlawful, as forbidden by God, either in special or in general. If it be said, but there are some things Indifferent, neither commanded, nor forbidden by God, as the Division above was Tripartite. I Answer; There are three things in themselves abstractedly considered which
are

are Indifferent, neither morally good nor bad; but in Worship, nothing Imposed is Indifferent, but it is either expedient for Decency and Order, and so commanded and necessary; or Inexpedient in the use, and so forbidden and unlawful; It is asserted by our *Casnist*, *Case 2.* [No one Action (he might have added, no Ceremony) in Religious Exercises is of its own nature so Indifferent, but that by the Circumstances, it easily becomes good or evil.] Good, if it be expedient in, or useful to the Worship: evil, if any waies Inconvenient in its use, that is, Inexpedient, or hurtful to the Worship. Of this more in the next.

2. [Nothing Inexpedient may be imposed in Worship: but such are our Ceremonies; *ergo* &c.] The *Major* is fully conceded above, and proved also by very good Reasons; this for one, [All things indifferent and not expedient, are not lawful but sinful.] If not expedient things, that is, not useful to the worship, be sinful, then much more, things inexpedient that is, hurtful to the worship, are sinful: In the Explication of this Term, *Inexpedient*, it was shewed, that as, *Expedient*, imports something positive, useful, helpful to the worship; so, *Inexpedient*, must (in the just opposition) signifie something prejudicious, hurtful to it: Not *privatively* only, which may be taken for some things purely Indifferent; but positively, as hurtful, troublesome, burdensome, &c. The *Minor*, that the Ceremonies in Controversie, are *inexpedient* and hurtful to the worship, or worshippers, is abundantly proved by others, and evident by Experience: as violating most of his 7 Rules, given for regulating the Imposition of Indifferent things in worship, *Case 8.* Take the Particulars briefly.

1. [They break the Peace of the Church, which ought primarily to be regarded in Imposition of such things.] The *Casnist* proceeds excellently and boldly in the Vindication of his second Rule for Publick Peace. I wish the Imposers of our Ceremonies would read or hear his words, and seriously lay them to heart. [God is the God of Peace and Order, of Peace as well as Order. And as the Order, so the Peace of the Church (without which, there is no Order) is precious with him, and with all that have the Spirit of God, and any care of his Church: Should any thing give way to Peace, and should not things Indifferent? Are not these Indifferent? Is not Peace necessary in many respects?] See the Place. Who knows not, that as the first Breach of the Publick

D

Peace,

Peace of the Church, was about a Ceremony, or thing Indifferent; so these Ceremonies imposed have for many years broken the peace of our Church, and now worst of all? I shall add a few more of the Reverend *Casuits* words. [Who can think it wisdom to force any thing that is but indifferent, to the endangering so necessary a thing as peace, or the dividing of the Church of God, or provoking any considerable part thereof to separate from us?] But I forbear.

2. They are offensive to weak Brethren [who (as he well) though weak, are not to be thrown to the wals, without any regard, yea the Scripture reasons us to a greater tenderness to the weaker part of the Church.] And more to this purpose. Things inexpedient of this nature are described by our Rev. *Casuit*, to be such as are troublesome to good Consciences, burdensome, &c. telling us, Ceremonies of the Church ought not to be hurtful to the Church, troublesome, &c. pag. 49. The Apostles had a special care of this, *μὴ παρενοχλεῖν*, not to trouble *Gentile* Believers with *Jewish* Ceremonies, *Acts* 15. 19. And how much trouble and sad distractions these Ceremonies have brought upon many truly tender Consciences, is too visible. While they were put upon this Rack, either to violate the peace of their Consciences, or to run upon their utter undoing by the rigour of the Law. I commend to their Consideration a Speech of Mr. *Rogers*, to be seen. p. 40. (a sufficient Defender of Ceremonies.) [He that in things indifferent hath not a tender care of weak Christians, sheweth that there is not that Charity in him, nor regard of his Brethren which God commanded.] But I pray Sir, Ought there not to be the same tender care of weak Christians, after they are commanded? Let him resolve it.

3. The next Rule violated, to render them inexpedient, is [that of Edification; the grand Level of all Church-power (saith our Author) Edification, and not its Destruction, in the whole or in any part. The great Principle of such Impositions must be Charity, not envy at, or desire of revenge, upon any person or party otherwise minded. Not to shew victory over them, or dominion over their Faith or Actions.] Add the next words, with a very little variation. [Things I doubt, not sincerely abhorred by our present Governours, as nor by our former] Things then that make not for Edification, but rather against it, ought not to be imposed

posed in worship; because they are inexpedient, either privatively, as not furthering Edification, or positively, as hindering or hurting it. But our Ceremonies, and other Impositions do rather hinder, then further Edification; and by Edification I mean true spiritual Edification, not carnal or superstitious; there are some things, that in (*Tertullians Language*) do *adificare ad Gehennam*; edifie downwards, or to destruction; that is, to take men off from the power of Godliness, and make them *formal*, placing all their Religion in Ceremonies, and Ceremonious Worship; as it was with the old Papists, the Pharisees, and at this day with the new Pharisees the Papists; yea they have turned to the destruction of precious Ministers, and pious people. I need say no more to that.

4. The next is, That they violate [that most noble Rule of all, that of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently, and in order.* A standing Rule (as he goes on) never to be crossed by any Authority under Heaven: yea God himself will never reverse it. Then (saies he) nothing that is indecent, or disorderly in Gods Worship, can warrantably be Imposed upon the Church.] Now how disorderly some things imposed in our Liturgy are, the Reverend Commissioners, and others have manifested. And if men were not resolved upon their own Inventions: Is not Kneeling at the Lords Supper a disorderly Gesture? Not only varying from the first Pattern, but from the Order of all Nations, who stand or sit, but never kneel at a Supper? and as contrary to the *Custom* of the prime or purest Churches for the first 600 years together; who by the Decrees of Councils, forbade Kneeling at Prayer, on all Lords daies? And *Custom* is one of the Rules of Imposition given by the *Casuiſt*. [Of very great use to indicate what is decent and orderly: Custom is Umpire of Indifferent things, &c. pag. 44] I might have made this a distinct Head by itself, But it may suffice to touch at it here.

5. The last Rule violated by humane Ceremonies imposed in Worship is, *Gospel or Christian Liberty*. [This must not be invaded by any Imposition which is infringed, if these and other rules be not observed. 1. If any thing indifferent be imposed, which any way checketh with the former Rules of Expediency, Peace, Offence of the weak, Edification, Decency, Order, and the Custom of the Churches. 2. If things indifferent be required

with equal severity as things necessary.] I list not to make the Application. How far these Rules are infringed in the Imposition of our Ceremonies, he that runs may read it. By what hath been said already, they are now sufficiently proved to be in inexpedient and hurtful to the Worship and Worshippers, and therefore ought not to be Imposed in our Worship. But further.

3 [Nothing purely Indifferent ought to be Imposed in Worship. This Proposition is fully yielded, asserted and proved above at the fourth Corcession. The Assumption, That our Ceremonies are such, *i. e.* purely Indifferent, will be manifested from the Description of a thing *Purely Indifferent*, given us by the Reverend *Casnist*, above in the Explication. [*A thing so Indifferent as to be of no use, or Service (in Worship) not more Expedient then Inexpedient.*] that is, (as I suppose) neither good nor bad. But I question whether any thing Imposed in worship is not either good or bad: yea therefore bad, because it is not good. The sense is Things purely Indifferent, are things useless, needless, idle, superfluous, the Worship being compleat and perfect without them; Now it is confest by all that our Ceremonies are not necessary (as was said above) but yet their *usefulness* is strongly pleaded for, as decent and orderly, adding Beauty and Lustre to the Worship: I could ask many Questions here. 1. Are not Gods Ordinances orderly and decent without them? If not, they charge the wisdom of Christ, as not able to manage his Worship decently and orderly without the help of foolish men. If so, what need have they of a *painted Beauty*, having a native beauty of their own? 2. To whom do Ceremonies seem to add Decency and Order to Divine Ordinances? Not to God, or truly Devout Christians, who are both best pleased with the simplicity of Gods prescribed Worship. To whom then I will not say. 4. What Decency, or Order is there in a *Surplice*, more then in a Gown, or Cloak (such as *Paul* wore) but of some mens fancying? 4. If they plead them useful as significant Rites, to excite Devotion, or Duty, &c. I shall therefore plead them *useless*, needless, &c. because what is expected by them, is done before, and better, by the Ordinances themselves. Of which more upon another account.

4. [Nothing really superstitious (or easily abused to Superstition) may be Imposed in Worship. But our Ceremonies are guilty of Superstition, and superstitiously abused, not only at *Rome*, but

but by many amongst our selves ; *ergo*, &c.] The first Proposition was the fifth Concession : but lightly touched, intended to be more largely handled here. Thus the Rev. *Casnist* speaks more fully. [Upon supposition that the Idolatry, or superstition (and superstition is a degree of Idolatry) cannot be severed from the use of a thing, or very hardly done ; Idolatry and Superstition must have no Indulgence : the Serpent it self must be broken in pieces ; and that famous Rule of Pope *Stephen* is applauded by all,] See pag. 141. (The rather because it is the Testimony of a Pope against his Successors) the words are these. [If some of our Predecessors have done some things which at that time might be without fault, and afterwards are turned into Errour and Superstition, without any delay, and with great Authority, they may be destroyed by Posterity.] But Superstition being not in the things used, or required, but in the persons that superstitiously require, or use them, grounded in the false Doctrine, and Superstitious Opinion which persons have of them, how shall we come to know when things are superstitiously abused ? And then how can we charge our Ceremonies with Superstition ? Our Rev. *Casnist* hath given us some rules to try them by, pag. 130, &c. which we shall apply to the case in hand as we go. Only premising these two things. 1. That we limit not our Discourse only to the 3 Ceremonies, *Surplice*, *Cross*, and *Kneeling*, but enlarge it to any other Rites and Ceremonies Imposed and used in the Publick Worship ; even to the Liturgy it self, which being the *Form* of divine Service, as it is called, may be stiled, a *Grand Ceremony*. 2. That it must not be expected that all the Rules of Discovery should be applied to every particular Ceremony to prove it superstitious ; but any one may suffice, if rightly applied. And now I proceed.

1. The first way of Discovery of *Superstition* is by the 4 Characters thereof given by Learned Divines. An Opinion of Merit ; of Worship ; of Perfection ; of Necessity. Any one of these found in our Ceremonies will testify the persons that so use them to be Superstitious.

1. Of *Merit*. [When (to take his own words) we think God is bound to reward our Inventions, and that by our Purse or Labours we purchase his favour, this is Superstition.] And does not a great *Rabbi* of our Church (whose Learning and Books are not only applauded, and admired as *Oracles*, but approved as Orthodox.

rhodox by our Rulers,) profess openly and confidently. [It is his Doctrine that *Will-worship*, (his *Free-will-Offerings*) are more commendable, more acceptable, and more rewardable with God then commanded Duties.] Amongst which Free will Oblations, the *Liturgy* is one, great one, the only Form of Divine Service, as it is called by some; and do not the vulgar and many higher persons esteem it to be most commendable, most acceptable, and consequently most rewardable Service of God? and if not with their Purse, yet by the labour of their Lips; in bearing a part in that Service, to purchase his Favour? And is not this Superstition? If it be rewardable, it must be either by some Promise, but there is none such in Scripture. Or of due Debt. *Rom. 4.* but that is plain Merit; there's no third way to ground the Reward on.

2. Of *Worship*. [When things are required as parts, or of the Essence of Divine Worship, or so used, this is Superstition.] But the *Liturgy* it self is by the Rulers made and called the Form of Divine Worship, not a part only, but the whole Essence and Substance thereof. 2. Ceremonies are esteemed by all Religions, Rites of Worship, Ceremonial worship, and so parts of worship, (as was proved above.) 3. They are made by the Imposers, *Religions*, not civil Ceremonies, and so parts of Religion, that is, of Worship, and so used by many: Certainly Kneeling at Sacrament is a part of external worship, and so esteemed and used by most.

3. Of *Perfection*. [When we conceive the true Beauty of the Church, and the Perfection of Christianity consisteth in things of humane Invention. This is Superstition.] And do not some, on this side *Rome*, place the Perfection of Christianity, and the beauty of Religion, in Pompous Ceremonies, Glorious Temples, Sweet and melodious Musick, Gawdy Priestly Garments, a compleated Liturgy, &c. And do not many think the Service *undecent* without a Surplice? the Baptism *imperfect* without the Cross? the Sacrament *irreverently* received without Kneeling? Is not this gross superstition?

4. Of *Necessity*. [When such things are required, and so used, as simply necessary in their Nature, being but things Indifferent. This is also Superstition.] And I pray, hath not a Learned Doctor a Late Bishop, pleaded the Liturgy to be so necessary, that without it, there can be no Religion, no honesty, no Allegiance. And do

do not the Late Commissioners plead a Precept of Scripture for their Ceremonies? Not an Allowance only, but a Command to institute Ceremonies? And is not that necessary? In a word, does not the Late A^c make them so necessary (as far as they can) that the commanded worship must rather be omitted, then any of their humane divine Service omitted? that men must not worship God without observation of their Ceremonies? Wear a Surplice, or pray not, preach not: Cross the Child, or baptize not: Kneel, or receive not the other Sacrament. And for the ordinary users of them, it is observable, that humane Inventions added to the Worship of God, as they are more strictly observed then the prescribed Worship of God; *Micah 6. ult.* so after long continuance, they are esteemed necessary; as (falsly) supposed to be of Divine Original. These are the ordinary Characters of Superstition, which I could wish were not too visible spots in the face of our Church; But I believe there are more and other waies to discover Superstition, then these. As, 1. To put Holiness in things, times, places. 2. To put vertue, efficacy, in things which they have not neither in their Natures, nor by Divine Institution. 3. To put significations upon Ceremonies in Divine Worship. Of which more by and by.

2. The next Rule is [when upon evident and undeniable grounds of General Practise, it appears to the sober and unbyassed sort of men, that a thing is used superstitiously in any of the former Respects, then no doubt there is an appearance of Superstition.] Now first the Generality of our Nation, are proved afore, to be superstitious in the use of our Liturgy and Ceremonies. And for the Learned that conform to them, some are known to be Popishly superstitious; in Bowing, Crossing, &c. Some are byassed by Profits or Preferments that are gotten or lost thereby. Only some few Sober, Learned and unbyassed persons are free from the guilt of Superstition: sticking to the simplicity of Gospel-worship.

3. A third Rule given, and most undoubted, is [Look to the Doctrine of the Church, whence the Grounds of Imposition and Practise are drawn: If they be false and superstitious, then there is an appearance of evil to be avoyded.] We joyn issue in this also, and apply it to the Case in hand.

1. The Doctrine of the Church though found in most of the 39 Articles, hath yet been scrupled at by Nonconformists in the Institution

Institution of Ceremonies ; and the Doctrine and Power given questioned : [The Church hath power to Impose Ceremonies,] see the Article : and this is asserted by that great Advocate of this Church cited above, and more confidently by a Late Bishop. Upon this Principle and bottom are all our Ceremonies, and all those at *Rome* founded, and is most certainly false ; as is proved elsewhere.

2. They are held forth in practise, as *Moral means* to excite Devotion, and teach and provoke to Duty : the *Surplice* to Purity, the *Cross* to Constancy, &c. And upon these Reasons commended, and commanded by the Church her self, (*Preface to the Liturgy* :) and by her Champions propugned, which renders them superstitious ; as will further appear on another Head.

4. The last Rule is [When we have some unquestionable Reason to suspect the design of our Governours, to betray the Church to Superstition and Idolatry, contrary to the known Doctrine of it] enough, and enough ! This Symptome hath been visible formerly in some chief Rulers of the Church, who were known to be Popishly affected : and laboured to bring in Superstition and Idolatry into the Church, by setting up *Images, Crucifixes, Altars* in the Churches, requiring Bowings at the Name of Jesus, and to, or towards the Altars : Asserting holiness of Times, Places, &c. which God never consecrated : What some in chiefest places of the Church are now designing, time will manifest. Sufficient hath been spoken to prove our Ceremonies to be superstitious, and therefore not to be Imposed, or if Imposed, to be repealed, and reversed.

5. [Nothing doubtful, or suspected justly to be sinful may be Imposed in Worship.] This was the 6th. *Postulatum*, either to be granted, or proved : How far the Rev. *Casuiſt* hath yielded to this Proposition, may be seen above, and what was evinced from his Concession. Other Learned and Judicious Divines assert, and prove it more fully ; Take some of their own words. First, the famous Mr. *Hales*. who propounds this as a remedy of Schism. [To have all Liturgies and Publick Forms of Service so framed, as that they admit not of particular and private Fancies, but contain only such things in which all Christians do agree. To charge the Church with things unnecessary, was the first beginning of all Superstition and Schisme : — and concludes, wheresoever false or suspected
Opinions

Opinions are made a part of Church-Liturgy, he that separates is not the Schismatick; for it is alike unlawful, to make profession of known, or suspected falshood, as to put in practise unlawful or suspected actions.] See more in his Book of Schism. Or as his words are cited more largely by Mr. *Stillington*, who agrees with him in the Assertion, and gives a strong Reason against the Imposition of suspected things. [As for publick Forms of Divine Service such of all things certainly, should be so composed, as to be the least subject to any scruples from any person whatsoever, being on purpose composed for the declaration of mens Unity and Consent in their publick Worship.] And let me add my Mite to the Heap; In worship there is required *Unanimity* of hearts, rather than *Uniformity* in Ceremonies; so the Apostle: *Be ye all of one mind. Speak the same thing, Phil. 2.2.* And all should say *Amen* to the same Prayers, *1 Cor. 14.* Which cannot be done in things to any doubtful, or suspected to be false or unlawful.

*1/en. part. 1.
pag. 120, &c.*

*See Rom 15.
5, 6. & 1 Cor.
1. 10.*

And now I shall not need to prove the Assumption. I shall only use Mr. *Hales* his words cited above, spoken indeed of *Image* worship, applicable to our Ceremonies. [They are acknowledged by all to be unnecessary, by many held unlawful, by most suspected or doubtful;] and therefore may not lawfully be imposed in Worship.

6 Lastly, [No significant thing (or Ceremony) signifying either the Favour of God, or the Grace of the Sacrament, or to be a means of receiving any Blessing from God, may by men be Imposed in Worship: But such are our Ceremonies; *ergo, &c.*] The *Major* Proposition is fully granted above in the 7th. Concession; and further confirmed thus; Because significations of such things, put upon things or Ceremonies in worship make them Sacraments, too like to those of Christs Institution, at least (as he) Semi-Sacraments, which *Papists* call Sacramentals. And indeed they fall under the Definition of a Sacrament, given in the Church-Catechism, [A Sacrament is an outward visible sign, of an inward and invisible Grace,] and therefore an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual Grace, is a Sacrament. Now, as in the *Holy Perfume* in the Old Law, there was a strict Prohibition that no man should dare to make the like, so is there a stricter prohibition (if stricter may be) in the second Commandment, that no man presume to make a Sacrament, (which is a part of worship) or any thing like

Exod 30.33.

a Sacrament, or part of worship. The Jealousie of God will not endure it. It was *Jeroboams* sin (and therefore not such policy as he fancied) to make a *Feast, like unto the Feast in Judah*, 1 Kings 2.32. It remaines then to prove the *Minor*; that such significations are put upon our Ceremonies; that in their Imposition some of those significations are put upon them, and so practised by many Conformists.

1. That voluntary Services (such as our Ceremonies) are intended to signifie and procure the Favour of God in some respect, was openly professed by a Learned *Rabbi* of this Church, approved *cum Licentiâ Superiorum*, as was instanced above. And by those that esteem the Sacrament of Baptism, imperfect, without the Cross; or the other Sacrament irreverently received without Kneeling, it must be intended, that those Ceremonies do procure (and therefore signifie) the Favour of God: but I let that pass as the sense of private persons, (for so it will be answered) and not as the Judgment of the Church.

2. [They are Imposed to signifie the Grace of the Sacraments, at least in part,] with this only difference, that the Sacraments do signifie the whole Covenant of Grace, or the whole Grace of the Covenant; these some particular Graces thereof: as the *Surplice* to signifie *Purity*, the *Cross* *Constancy*: and what are these but *Semi Sacraments* (as he calls them) and the Definition of a Sacrament fits them handsomly. The outward sign of the Surplice signifying the inward invisible Grace of Purity. The outward visible sign of the Cross signifies the inward invisible Grace of Constancy in our Profession: signified before by Baptism; Sacraments are signs to remember us of the whole Covenant of Grace, in both the parts; of Grace from God to us; of Duty from us to God. Ceremonies are imposed, to signifie (they say) our Duty to God, but not the Grace of God to us. *Ex. gr.* the Surplice (being pure *white* Linnen) signifies what purity, holiness, chastity, should be in a Minister, (say the same proportionably of the Cross.) But does it not also signifie Grace from God, to work those duties or graces in us? (for they are both graces and duties) If so: What differs it from a Sacrament? If not; it will prove an idle and vain Ceremony; and for that reason not to be Imposed in worship, or if Imposed, to be repealed. In the Old Testament, they were commanded, to make, and weare *Fringes, Frontlets, Phylacteries*,
[To

[To look upon it, and to remember all the Commandments of the Lord, and do them, and be holy unto their God, Numb. 15. 39, 40.] And being things appointed by God, no doubt but to the right users of them, they were accompanied with grace to perform those duties; and those were part of their Ceremonial Worship. But if they had devised their Ceremonies of their own heads to the same religious ends, in vain might they have expected the like efficacy: though still they had been *religious Ceremonies*, and parts of worship, but false. And when the *Pharisees* did add to these Ceremonies [by making broad the *Phylacteries*, and enlarging the *Borders*, (that is, the Fringes) of their Garments Mat. 23. 5] Our Saviour reproves not only their *Hypocrisie*, in seeming holier to men; but also their *Superstition*, in seeming wiser then God, in their own additions. As in another case of their own Traditions, their *Ablutions* before they did eat, washing of Pots, Cups, and Beds, as well as hands, they made this a Ceremony, to signifie what *purity* and *holiness* ought to be in themselves and others; expecting no doubt the same (if not greater) efficacy from this Ceremony as from those Ablutions commanded by God in their Law; and for this our Saviour chargeth them with *Will-Worship*, [Mat. 15. 8, 9 *In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men.*] How applicable all this is to our Ceremonies, I need not say: the *Surplice* answers to their Fringes, the *Cross* to their Frontlets, being applied to the Childs Forehead: If any shall say these our Ceremonies as they are only *monitory* of Duty, not *exhibitory* of Grace; so the like efficacy is not given to them, by the *Doctrine* of our Church. To that see the next.

3. [They are instituted (as I conceive by their words) to be a means of receiving some Blessing from God] that is, to be *moral* causes to work those Duties, or Graces in the *Users* of them; and such (and not *Physical* causes) were not only those Frontlets, Fringes, &c. but the Word and Sacraments also of God appointment. To make good this Charge, I shall produce the words of a Late Advocate of our Ceremonies: [If men put any force or efficacy in Circumstances devised by men, which neither God hath promised to make good, nor Nature it self is apt to produce, a religious Form is impressed on them by an erroneous Intention.] That more vertue or efficacy is put upon our Ceremonies, then God hath promised, or Nature can produce, shall be made out

Pref. to the
old Liturgy

Eccles. Pol.

Of the Chur.
lib. 4. cap. 30.
ad finem.

D. B.

from their own acknowledgments. 1. The Church it self, in retaining and instituting them hath these words; [We have been content with only those Ceremonies, which make to decent Order, and pious Discipline, and which [Note that] by some excellent and special signification, are able to call to memory, a Duty to be performed to God, in the stupid mind of man to his edification] It must be remembred here: 1. That these Ceremonies are to be used in the Worship of God. 2. They are able to mind men of a Duty to God. 3. They are useful not to civil, but spiritual Edification: just as the Frontlets and other Ceremonies were. Now this is a supernatural effect expected by the use of them, which neither by any promise of God, nor by their own nature, they are able to produce. But 2. the *Apologists*, who understood the mind of the Church, and were approved by her. Go further: As, 1. The Learned *Hooker* affirms, [That Ceremonies do leave a stronger and deeper Impression.] He must mean it, as I suppose, of a *Spiritual* Impression, (being used in the Worship of God) and that stronger and deeper then the very Ordinances of God do exhibite, or else they are idle, and needless, where the same or an equal Impression, is made by the Ordinances themselves; *ex. gr.* The *Cross* used in Baptism, must be supposed to make a deeper Impression then Baptism it self, &c. which if it be not Superstition in a high degree, I know not what is. 2. The Learned Dr. *Field* speaks fuller to the purpose: Who having strongly confuted the Popish Superstitions, because they put a supernatural force in these Ceremonies: addes this; [“Our Ceremonies are adhibited. to put “in mind, and (mark this) to excite greater Fervour and Devotion, and to be of force to express such spiritual and heavenly affections, dispositions, motions, or desires, such as are or ought to be in men.”] And I pray, what did the Legal Ceremonies appointed by God (before-mentioned) do more? Or what is this less then is intended to be effected by *Romish* Ceremonies? If it be said (as it is) [Our Ceremonies are monitory only, external occasions, and objects, whereby the mind of man worketh upon its self, not causes working by some vertue in them.] I Answer, 1. The very Ordinances of God Word and Sacraments, and those other named Ceremonies, did not work *physically* by any vertue in them, but morally by the Institution of God; and yet were they and are means to procure and receive a Blessing from God. 2. The words

words are plain, they are appointed to excite spiritual Devotion, make stronger impressions, &c. and is not that a working cause, or a *means* used in worship to those ends? which is flatly against the Second Commandment. 3. If they stir up spiritual devotion, heavenly affections, &c. are not those supernatural effects? 4. If they excite such effects in mens hearts, must not that presuppose, all that use them to be spiritually minded, and disposed? How else can they stir up in them, those affections that are not in them? But then what use are they of to Natural and carnal men? There is a carnal Devotion, as well as spiritual. To stir up carnal devotion will not make them acceptable to God: If they stir up spiritual devotion in carnal men, is not that a supernatural effect ascribed to humane Ceremonies? And are they not made hereby as *operative*, and exhibitive of Grace as those Instituted by God? Let it be considered! I could enlarge this Discourse with other Testimonies of Learned Ceremonialists; to the same purpose: and with the Practice and Opinion of many that dote upon them, who expect *Grace Favour*, and a *Blessing* from God, upon such Devotion: But I forbear, and now draw up the Argument into one view against the Imposition of our Ceremonies, *twisted* up of a six-fold Cord, which will not easily be broken. Thus, [Nothing sinful, inexpedient, purely-indifferent, superstitious, doubtful, or significant Ceremony may by men be Imposed in Divine Worship.] But our Ceremonies are guilty of all these Crimes; therefore they may not by men be Imposed in Worship, and consequently if Imposed, to be repealed, which was our first undertaking, now performed.

II. *Of Submission to them, if Imposed.*

The hardest and greatest work is now over, and I shall not need to be long or large in the two following Particulars As to the present Question. [Whether if such things be Imposed by Authority, we may lawfully submit unto them?] It is often pretended by the *Casuiſt* and others, [that though the things be Inconvenient, and Inexpedient, yet the Command of Authority alters the state of the Quest. pag. 39, 69, &c. and makes them to us necessary by a necessity of Obedience, (though not so in their own natures) by vertue of a Divine Commandment. [*Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves.*] Indeed this pretence seems to put

put a demur to the Case : and is the foundation of all his Discourse in the greatest part of it, concerning submission to such Impositions : But it is easily removed, by a Distinction or two.

1. Of the sense of the word *Inconvenient*, which he substitutes for the word *Inexpedient*, to mollifie the harshness thereof, as was noted in the Explication of Termes, which having once presumed to do, he then supposes (unjustly also) those things now called *Inconvenient*, to be things lawful not only in their own nature, and *extracultum*, but also in their use, and in Worship. which is contradicted by himself, when he makes things inconvenient in their use to be sinful, p. 68. Of which afore.

2. Of things inexpedient or inconvenient, which may be conceived to be of two sorts. 1. In regard of meer Circumstances of Worship, as an inconvenient place, or an unseasonable time thereof, which must be taken, or no other allowed for publick worship, wherein the Authority may sin in Imposing: as violating, the Rules of Decency, Order, or Edification, 1 Cor. 14. but the Subject sins not in submitting, yea should sin in not submitting. 2. With respect to *humane Ceremonies*, which are inconvenient, and inexpedient in their use, that is hurtful to the Worship, or Worshippers: which are alwaies sinful in worship, and may no more lawfully be submitted to, then Imposed in worship, as he hath often granted. Now then our Ceremonies being proved to be so many waies inexpedient, that is, sinful in worship, one Argument (but a complicated one, and so much the stronger) will dispatch the business. Thus. [No sinful, inexpedient, unnecessary, superstitious, doubtful, significant Ceremonies, may be submitted to, if Imposed in Worship. But our Ceremonies are proved to be such; *ergo* they may not be submitted to.] Against this Conclusion neither the *Peace* of the Church, nor pretended *Duty*, nor too much desired *Safety* (his threefold Cord, used to draw others to Conformity with himself) can dispense, till this Argument be enervated, and made voyd. I proceed to the last.

III. Of Assenting and Consenting to them.

This third and last Question is newly occasioned by the Late Act for Uniformity, and the too general compliance of Ministers, with it: not only to submit to the Ceremonies, and other things Imposed

Imposed as to Practise, (which in some things might be tollerable) but also to enslave their Judgments, to a full approbation of all and every thing contained in, and prescribed by it. Which one would think, should have stumbled many more till they had seriously considered both what the things are (which are very many) and also have sufficient ground for so large a Submission. When it is evident that many of the Declarers and Subscribers, never saw the Book, nor considered the Reasons of so deep an Engagement, but hastily swallowed down all, with an Implicite Faith trusting to their Rulers. Now if there be but one thing Inexpedient in it, one thing false, or evil, that is sinful: As submission to so universal a Practise of it, is proved unlawful, so the giving an [unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained in it] can by no good Conscience be justified. That Act takes in the whole Book, as now it is Published and Established. And contains the Epitome, or rather Volume of the *English*, Protestant, Episcopal Religion.

1. The Form of Doctrine, or Confession of Faith in the 39 Articles.

2. The Mode of Worship in the Liturgy.

3. The Model of Discipline in the Book of Ordination, or Consecration, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.] All these to be at one Lump, submitted, subscribed, assented, consented to, and that unfeignedly; It was partly yielded above, that in some cases it may be lawful not only for peace sake, but also for Conscience sake, to submit to some thing Inconvenient, (as an Inconvenient Circumstance) if Imposed by a lawful Authority: But now the Question is, of declaring openly an unfeigned assent and consent to a thing (any thing, if any there be) Inconvenient in the Book, which to me imports an Approbation of it: as shall be shewed ere long: I shall only desire to remember the Explication of the Terms. That *Assent* hath respect to the truth of a thing: *Consent* to the Goodness: *Unfeigned* to the sincerity of both. I now propound the Question the third time.

Whether it be lawful for Ministers to conform so far to the Late established Book for Uniformity, as Publickly to declare an unfeigned Assent and Consent, to all and every thing contained in, and prescribed by it?

To.

To the Decision of this great Question, one would easily think, little need be said, considering what hath been said already, against divers things contained in that Book; any one whereof if proved sinful (as I believe some are, and more will be) might be a sufficient bar to suspend either Assent or Consent to the truth or goodness, much more the practise of them, which yet is promised in the Subscription to them; I shall argue first *ex concessis & probatis*; and then add some more special Reasons in some Particulars.

1. In General; thus I assault them. [If divers things Imposed and to be submitted to be sinful, (the Imposition and Submission to them being therefore sinful) then it is much more sinful to declare an unfeigned Assent and Consent to them, yea to all and every thing contained in and prescribed by that Book; but the Antecedent is most true, and asserted by themselves, and where they are shut, proved so to be: the Consequence is made undeniable by the Apostles Logick and Divinity, [*Rom 1 ult* Who though they know that *they that do such things are guilty or worthy of death*; not only do such things, but also *συνοδοῦν*, consent to, or favour them that do them.] The Argument is taken *a minore ad majus*: It is bad to do things sinful, especially against Knowledge and Conscience, but much worse to assent and consent unfeignedly to the truth, and goodness of such things. The reason is, because a man may do a thing sinful, either out of Ignorance, or inadvertency, or the violence of a Temptation; but he cannot unfeignedly assent, and consent to the doing of them, or to them that do them, without deliberation, and knowingly against his clearly convinced Conscience. And the more of *Will* is in a sin, the higher is the aggravation of it. Now this is observable, that few Conforming Ministers there are, which do not believe some things in that Book to be inconvenient, burdensom, troublesom, and scarce Orthodox, either in Doctrine, Worship, or Discipline: And some in my hearing have already complained, that the burden to read all prescribed, and to preach when they have done, (as they ought to do, being of Divine Institution) is a Burden which they are not able to bear, as some of their Forefathers complained. And to omit or shorten Preaching, to enlarge the Church-Service, they are ready to profess to be against their Consciences; as a making voyd the Commandment of God, by observing the Traditions of men.

2. [It is highly sinful to Assent and Consent unfeignedly to things Inexpedient, purely Indifferent, (that is Idle, or Useless) Superstitious, Doubtful, or Significant Humane Ceremonies, as against the Second and Third Commandments,] and because such things are sinful in Worship. But to some such things, yea many, do they *assent* and *consent*, who declare their assent and consent to all and every thing Contained in, and Prescribed by that Book, as hath clearly been proved, *ergo*, &c.

3. [It is highly Presumptuous, Sacrilegious, if not Blasphemous, to make that Book equal to the *Sacred Bible*, and the Powers Imposing it, as infallible, as those were that wrote the holy Scriptures, (as the *Pope* does the *Apocrypha*, and the Traditions of the Church.)] But this is done by all that in that manner make that Declaration: For what can more be declared and asserted of the Holy *Canonical*, Spirit inspired Scriptures, then an unfeigned assent to the *Truth*, and consent to the *Goodness* of all and every thing contained in those Books?

4. [To assent and consent to the Imposition of things unlawful, in Worship, is to make themselves twice guilty of sin, once as they assent and consent to things unlawful, and a second time, as they confirm the Imposers in that sinful Imposition. For when will they repent of, or repeal these sinful Impositions, when they are confirmed to be true, and lawful, by so many complying Ministers in so high a Declaration?

5. To declare and profess so publickly before God and their People, their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing in that Book: believing, that some things are Inconvenient and Inexpedient, which they wish were removed, is gross Dissimulation, and desperate hypocrisie. But many of the Compliers do believe and confess some such things to be contained in that Book, either not true, or not lawful, and yet assent and consent to all and every thing contained in it. Or suppose them so corrupted in their understanding and Judgments, as to be perswaded of the Goodness and Truth of all and every thing therein, it may easily be proved, and hath been already, that some things in it are not true, as to matter of Doctrine, and some things not lawful, as to matter of Worship or Discipline, if I might safely dispute against that Book, having a Law to render it liable to a *Premunire*. But Truth is

Truth, and to be acknowledged, when we are called to give testimony to it. This hath been done by many, and not yet answered. The Book contains the whole of *English Religion*, in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, and in every one of those Defects, Imperfections, and Corruptions manifested; and yet without Reformation of many things, imposed and pressed on us with more rigour then formerly. See some Particulars.

1. In Doctrine. As 1. In the Articles of Religion, *Art. 20.* [The Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies,] which words being ambiguous, taken either for meer Circumstances of Worship, for Order, Decency, &c. or for Sacred Rites, and religious Ceremonies; In the first sense they are true, but doubtful: To which no unfeigned assent can be given, till the distinction be given: In the last sense (in which they are usually taken,) they are proved to be false, above in this Discourse. And some other principal points of Doctrine there are so doubtfully worded, that as *Papists* and *Arminians*, have glossed them to their Opinions, so no tender Conscience can safely give so full assent to them as true, till they be explained, which was formerly denied and prohibited to be made by those that subscribed them.

2. In the *Liturgy*, some *Doctrinals* are delivered and prescribed to be assented to; as first, a false Translation of the Psalmes, according to the errours of the Vulgar *Latine*, still retained to be read; not to speak of their leaving out of the Titles of many Psalmes, which in *Hebrew* are Canonical Scripture. And it is as unlawful to take from the word of God as to add to it; unless they intend to make amends for their Substraction of some, by Addition of other things: and that is sufficiently done, by addition of some *Apocryphal* Psalmes, *Te Deum*, *Benedicite*, and a great many Chapters of the Bookes called *Apocrypha*, to be read, a most for two moneths together; some whereof are false, and as very lying Legends as those used in the Romish Churches, and some newly added, not in before, as the History of *Susanna*, *Bell* and the *Dragon*. And what is this but (as they at *Rome*) a Canonizing in part, of the *Apocrypha*, making it equal to the Scripture in Divine Service, as part of their Doctrine; I might add that Assertion [That all Children Baptized are really regenerated, and want nothing necessary to their Salvation] which drawes after it, all or most of the

the *Arminian* and *Popish* Tenents

3. The *Homilies* are part of the Doctrine of the Church, ratified by the 35 Canon, and prescribed to be read by every Minister, and now with the Articles enjoyned to be assented to unfeignedly as true. In these have been observed some false Doctrines; as to justify *plurality* of Wives, by the old Fathers, *Hom. Of the time and place of Prayer*, pag. 147. That *Almes* purgeth away all sins, delivereth from death, *Hom. 2. Of Almes*, pag. 16. For proof whereof is cited, as good Scripture, *Tobit 4. 10.* & the Son of *Syrach*. Dare any Orthodox Minister declare his unfeigned assent to the Truth of these Doctrines? yet this is done by too many.

2. In *Worship*. There are some things not good, that is unlawful, to which yet an unfeigned consent is to be given. For the Ceremonies they are largely discovered to be sinful and unlawful above. To which may be added the *Apocryphal* Psalmes and Books made not only equal with the Divine Scriptures, but also parts of Divine Service, as fully as any part of the Word of God. Add to these the *Responds* of the Clerk and People, Women, Boyes and Wenches, clearly against the Apostle's Rules of Decency, Order, Edification, as may be easily manifested. And more might be said concerning the Ministers change of places, postures, ridiculous gesticulations, as if Divine Service were some Play, or Comedy to be acted; which causes the Name of God to be taken in vain against the third Commandment: Can any pious devout Minister give his unfeigned consent to these as good?

3. In *Discipline*. The Book of Ordination is the *Epitome* thereof, now joyned and established with the Articles and Liturgy. But there are some things in them proved to be false. As 1. That there are three kinds or Orders of Church Officers; *Bishops, Priests* and *Deacons*, when Scripture knowes but two: It being proved and confessed by Episcopal men, that in Scripture a Bishop and a Presbyter are one and the same Order and Office. 2. That *Ordination* by Presbyters is null. I add no more: To all these either false or unlawful do they assent and consent, which how they can do with a good Conscience, I understand not, but do admire.

6. And Lastly, (besides the burdens they have laid upon their weak Brethren, in a very considerable number, and the hurt they have done to the Church in the loss of so many Able Ministers, to the

the gratifying of Antichrist) they have by their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained in and prescribed by that Book, in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, as precluded all future hopes of Reformation, so also enslaved themselves, and their Successors of the Clergy to the power and yoke of Episcopal Tyranny: Just in the same manner, (if not measure) as the Popish Clergy are enslaved to the Pope, without all hope of freedom, till either Antichrist be fallen, or those strict Lawes for Conformity be repealed and broken: This is one chief Character of Antichrist, that he causeth all his Subjects (especially the Clergy) *to receive a Mark in their right hand, and in their Forehead, that none may buy or sell that want this Mark.* How far this is applicable to our present condition, any wise man will easily discern. The Bishops have now obtained their long Desire, and Design, to *subdue*, and enslave the Clergy to themselves (and with them the People) they having boared their Eares to their Door posts, and received a mark in their Foreheads, by their so Publick *Declaration*, and in their *Right Hand* by their *Subscription*, without which no Minister may buy or sell, that is, deal in any thing that concernes his Ministerial Office, or as a Schollar, to get a Livelihood. And whether this be not the slaying of the Witnesses (Natural or Civil) spoken of in the *Revelation*, or the Forerunner of it, I leave to prudent men to determine. And here I rest.

The

The Grand Case considered, as to the double Supplement annexed thereunto.

I. *Touching Things Inexpedient.*

I Begin with this (though it stand last in the Grand Case) partly because it is intended to be a *Support* to uphold his former Tract, which I have thoroughly ventilated; and partly because it must be the Foundation of the Main Case of *Conformity* to the Declarations required in the Late Act. For if the things in question, be not only *Inconvenient*, or burdensom, but also *Inexpedient*, that is, (according to his own Exposition of the word) *Sinful*, [*In vain is the Net spread before the eyes of any Fowl.*] No man of any good Conscience, can, or dare be taken with such *Chaffe*, as he hath here scattered, in stead of good Corn, to beguile and mislead his Readers.

Before I consider, what *fresh Supply* he hath brought, I shall premise some few Observations, as grounds to shake and frustrate all this second Undertaking.

1. He here again (as was complained of, and manifested, on his former cases) confounds *Inexpedient* with *Inconvenient*. Sometimes we hear of ["Things simply inexpedient, p. 144. which he expounds by things Inconvenient, p. 147. No small Inconvenience, p. 150. For some Inconveniences imposed on us, we ought not to quit our Ministry."] (Which we profess we would not do) and other the like Passages: when yet he told us, ["Things not Expedient in Worship ought not to be Imposed, or if Imposed, to be Submitted to."] as anon we shall hear.

2. *Inexpedient* may be taken, either *negatively*, for a thing not Expedient; or *positively*, for something hurtful: For as, *Expedient* is taken for *useful, helpful*, to the business we are about: So a thing *Inexpedient* (in a flat opposition, as was said) may be taken either way, for not-useful, or hurtful to it.

3. A thing inexpediently *evil*, or hurtful in Worship, may be taken either for *malum poene*, as troublesome, or burdensome, or for *malum culpa*, a thing sinful. The *Rev. Casuist* does not clearly distinguish these two senses, and which he means; and therefore seems secretly to pass *a genere in genus*: from one kind to another.

4. A thing may be *sinful*, either in *itself*, or in *its use* in Worship, from some Circumstance of time or place, &c. This Distinction is given us by the *Casuist*, p. 68. of the former *Tract*, and we shall make use of it hereafter.

5. A thing may be *Inexpedient* in two Respects; 1. In matters of Civil, and common *Affairs*, or in matters of *Religion* and Worship. Some Assertions of his, are true and allowable in the first, but not in the second respect. I needed not to have noted this, but that he seems to have forgotten (what he first intended) that he is tied to speak to things *Inexpedient* in Worship.

6. Things *evil* and *Inexpedient*, in both senses, as penally or sinfully such, may be considered or compared 3 waies.

1. One evil of punishment with another, a lesser with a greater; and here the Rule is, *e malis minimum*; chuse the least.

2. An evil of punishment, with an evil of sin; and here the Rule is, The greatest evil of punishment must be chosen, rather than the least evil of sin, as *Heb. 11. 25.*

3. One evil of sin with another, lesser, equal, or greater; and here the Rule is, *e malis neutrum, vel nullum.*

And now we come to the Case propounded [“Whether, or how far things inexpedient (not imposed in Worship, for that is peremptorily denied by the *Rev. Casuist* in the former *Tract*, but) may be submitted to, if imposed, by Authority?”] That was the Case before. [“What is to be done, when things *Inexpedient* are imposed? *viz.* in Worship: Now an *Objection*, it seems, is lately started, and an Argument enforced from his own Principles, for the Negative, in this manner:

“Nothing sinful in Worship may be submitted to, though imposed by Authority; which is now proved by Scripture, we may not do evil, that good may come thereby: But *Inexpedient* things imposed in Worship are sinful; *ergo* not to be submitted to.”] The *Major* as it is obvious to any Religious Conscience, so it is often asserted in the other *Tract*: The *Minor* is also granted in the very terms: [“All Indifferent things not expedient, are not
“lawful,

"lawful, but sinful, p. 36.] And p. 34. Things not expedient to be done, ought not to be done.] What saies he now to it? Both the Propositions being his own, he must either yield the Cause, and own the *Conclusion*, or distinguish of one, or both the Propositions; which latter he attempts to do, as followeth:

["Things are evil or unlawful, either *in specie*, or *in genere* only, either in themselves, as prohibited by some special Law, Natural or Positive; or in respect to some Circumstance or Accident.] To which I reply in this manner; desiring to know to which Proposition he will apply this Distinction. 1. If to the *Major*, it must be thus; ["Things sinful against a special Commandment, may not be submitted to in Worship, but things forbidden by a general Commandment, may, if imposed by Authority.] For so he saies: ["Things of the second kind, prohibited in general, are not a violation of a special Law of God, but of a general, p. 145.] And such may be lawfully submitted to, or I know not what to make of his words: To say, that things prohibited by a *general* Law, are not a violation of a special Law, is a vulgar truth, and not befitting the *R. Casuists* Learning. And to say, things evil and unlawful either by a special or general Law, are not sinful, will less befit his Wisdom; for that is a contradiction: Things sinful (such are all prohibited by any Law of God) are not sinful. 2. If he apply his Distinction to the *Minor*, it must, I suppose be thus: ["Things Inexpedient are of two sorts; either such as are prohibited by a special, or by a general Commandment: the first sort are sinful, and not to be submitted to, but the latter may.] Will he stand to this? May any sinful thing in Worship be submitted to? Hath he not asserted the contrary, in the case of sinful things imposed? Besides, this Distinction comes here too late, being necessary to have been used, before he gave us that universal Proposition: ["All Indifferent things not-expedient, are not lawful, but sinful.] And now, belike, some *not-expedient* things are not sinful, but lawful in Worship. 3. Or if he shall say, by *Inexpedient*, he means only things *Inconvenient*, burdensome perhaps, but not sinful: the first may be submitted to, not the second: He saies true, but then he *equivocates* with us, in both his Tracts, in the sense of the word, *Inexpedient*: having told us, that all *Inexpedient* things in Worship, were sinful, and not to be done: and so slips *a genere in genus*. 4. He told us also, some things were sinful in *themselves*, and some

by *Inconveniency* in their use, p. 68. But both are sinful, and can either of them be lawfully submitted to? 5. His Instances of things prohibited *in genere*, are *Indecencies*, and Disorders, and the like, in Worship. But this is a great Mistake, in a *Divine*, in a *Casualist*: For there are as special Lawes against them, either in Nature, or Scripture, and as Moral, as against Murder, or Theft; viz. either the Second or Third Commandments, as Additions to the Worship, or prophanation of it, and consequently a *taking of Gods Name in vain*; or by 1 Cor. 14. 40. where specially forbidden: Yea, they seem prohibited by a Law of Nature, [*"A standing Law, (said he) never to be crossed by any Authority under Heaven, yea the God of Heaven being the God of Order, will never reverse it, &c.*] p. 43. of the other Cases: If not imposed, nor may they be submitted to: The Reason is the same for both, because they are sinful in their use, or by the circumstance of the time, when used in Worship, being now *Inexpedient*, and for that reason both unlawful to be imposed, or if imposed, to be submitted to, p. 34.

Hereupon it seemes strange to me, which here he saies; [*"If the Inexpediency of such a thing, for which alone it is prohibited, be either separated from it, or overballanced, it becomes repugnant to no Law at all, &c.*] For, 1. This is as if he should say, separate the sin from it, and it is not sinful: What is the sin of a thing inexpedient in Worship, but the use of it in Worship? Separate the use of such a thing from Worship, and it may be lawfully used out of Worship: e. g. a *Surplice*, and the Sign of the Cross used in Worship, as *Symbolical Rites*, or Ceremonies, we say, are sinful: but out of Worship, the one may be lawfully used, by a *Groom* or Porter; the other for a *Sign* of a dwelling house, &c. But in worship, the sin and the thing used, are inseparable. 2. Neither can the sinful *Inexpediency* be overballanced by any external, temporal, Expediencies: [*"An evil of sin may not be done, to prevent the greatest poenal evil, or to procure the greatest temporal good.*] And here he secretly slides from one kind of evil to another. *Calvins* Testimony is not to the purpose; for he speakes of *Civil usages*, or Customes of the place, and not of Religious Rites or Ceremonies:

The like *Mistakes* are in the next. [*"That which by reason of Circumstances only, is evil, or unlawful, is so accidentally, and may be not immutably so.*] The first part is true; but a thing which

which is accidentally evil, may be immutably so, in its use, in worship, as an *Indecency*, or Disorder in Worship, is alwaies evil; sinfully evil, as was confessed. 2. ["That which is evil by accident, in one respect, may be good, yea better than another."] True also, if he speak of things *pœnally* evil: But if the thing be *sinfully* evil, (though but in *the use*, in Worship) all the respects in the world cannot make it good, much less, better to be done in Worship. 3. Hence the thing that seemed, and was *sinfully* Inexpedient, can by no Circumstances penally evil, be made (as he saies) expedient, much less lawful, and necessary: for so we may, yea must do evil, that good may come thereby. *Polanus* his Rule is *Golden*, and good in civil things penally evil; there the greater and more expediencies must overballance the lesser and fewer; but is a *Leaden* Rule, when sinful and penal evils meet together; the first must be left undone, whatever becomes of the other.

We must not do evil, to obtain good. He returnes to this. ["Yet we must do good to prevent evil, though the thing be good for nothing else."] I pray what is the meaning of the Apostles Rule? ["We must not do the least sinful evil, to obtain the greatest temporal good:"] But he by *evil*, understands some *pœnal evil* (not moral or sinful) when he saies, we must do good, to prevent evil: What good? Morally good? That's true, but then he secretly begs the Question, that Inexpedient things are morally good, in worship; or if otherwise, then he allowes us to sin, to prevent some penal evil: And what means he by evil, which we must prevent? If only penal, he permits us to do a sinful evil to prevent some penal evil, or if sinful, then he allows us to prevent one sin by doing another: For such we take things Inexpedient in worship to be. But (by the way) this is but an ill *Character* of the good he intends, that it is good for nothing else but to prevent the evil of suffering: I leave him to apply it. I shall not now stand to answer what he saies of the Apostles making of some inconvenient things *necessary*: It will come again more fitly, and fully to be considered in the next Case. All I say now, is but this; That if *Expediency* will make a thing good, & necessary, and our duty to do (as he asserts) then it may seem reasonable, at least, in worship, that *Inexpediency* should render a thing evil, and unlawful, and make it ones Duty not to do it.

The Testimonies of *Cypr. Ambrose, August.* are easily answered,
in

in a few words: They speak not of *Mystical Rites*, or significant Ceremonies, but of some civil external *Usages* gotten into worship; different in divers places; as *Socrates* tells us of many, in his time; as in observation of *Easter* or *Lent*: in receiving the Lords Supper at Evening or Morning, standing or sitting, &c. Such an Usage in Reformed Churches, is, that somewhere the Ministers preach with heads covered, otherwhere, bare-headed, and many the like: In such things, those *Ancients* advise to conform to the Usages of the places where they come: but surely, would never have wise people to comply in things inexpediently sinful, in worship, in any place.

The same may be said for Forreign and home-reformed Divines. ["Do not they (they abroad) either approve our Usages, or dislike them only as inconvenient? and those they dislike as such, do they not yet earnestly perswade to conformity to them, from a sad prospect of greater Inconveniencies, the disquiet of the Church, provoking Governours, and the laying aside the work of the Gospel?"] I might answer many things, but a Learned and Pious Non-conformist hath done it to my hands at large, to whom I referre the *Rev. Casuist*, for full satisfaction. The summe is this:

D. A. Fresh
Suite part 2.
P. 456.

1. Some of those Learned men, did, at the beginning of the Reformation, and before they had studied the Controversie about Ceremonies, suppose our *Usages* to be only *Inconvenient*, and burdens, and therefore advised, that for some Inconveniencies imposed here, they should not quit their Ministry, or hazard the Church. (Which Counsel we should be willing to embrace, were not many things to us unlawful.)

2. Some of them, yea many, upon more serious Consideration, do in their latter Writings, declare their Judgment of them, that they are unlawful.

3. Being in some perplexities, what to answer to those Inconveniencies feared, and out of tender humane Compassion to their Brethren here, like to suffer poverty, and hardship, did advise, comparatively, rather to Conformity, than to quit their Ministry; against their own Judgment. This, and much more, that Learned Professour. They did not therefore so sweetly agree together, as is pretended; for they agreed not with themselves.

As for *Illiricus*, who differed from the rest of his Brethren, in matter of Conformity; it was only or chiefly with respect to the *Incerims*, imposed by the *Emperour*; wherein were many *Popish Er-*

rors.

errors, he had better ground to oppose that Conformity, than others had to persuade unto it: And if some things now imposed, be (to us) as unlawful as those were, they that now refuse, have as good, (if not the same) Apology for themselves. And if that only was his *Crime*, and occasioned so many tumults, he was unjustly charged by *Beza*, ["That he promoted Popery, as if he had been hired by the Pope."] unless any will say, the preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles, was the cause of so many Tumults, where-ever they came. But rather, they that imposed those *Errors*, were the causers, and they that conformed to them, were the *Occasioners* of those Calamities, which fell upon *Non-conformers*: and did the *Pope* more service, by silencing those Pious men, from Preaching against those Errors. If *Illiricus* was an *hot-spirited* man, and had other Errors of his own (as this for one, that *Sin was a Substance*, &c.) which he too vehemently maintained, he might deserve that black *Character*, given him by the *Historian*; but not for persuading the *Ministers*, to lay down their Ministry, rather than conform to those many *Papish Errors*.

And for our own *Divines*, at home, that they were *subdued* by this Principle ["That we ought rather to conform to some things *Inexpedient*, (that is *Inconvenient*) than to lay down our *Ministry*,] is partly true, of some of them, that at first, taking things imposed to be only *Inconvenient*, and not unlawful, they did, in some things comply; But it is as evident, that they did esteem some things *unlawful*, and (like men under sad temptations) did contradict themselves; an example whereof, the *Rev. Casuist* gave us, in one of the most eminent among them, in his other Tract, p. 101. But the truth is, most of those named by him, lived, and died *Nonconformists*.

For Mr. *Sprint*, as he was prevailed upon, to conform, by that supposed, not proved Principle, that our *Ceremonies* were but *Inconvenient*, not unlawful; so no marvel, if he upon the same Principle, prevailed with others, perhaps unacquainted, and un-studied in the *Controversie*, and willing to be persuaded, for some reasons of their own. And if our *Rev. Cas.* perceive any *blossoms*, to appear in some, by the influence of his Resolutions, I fear it is with them, as with some over-forward trees, that *blossome* in *February*, and are blasted by some *March* winds, and Frosts: when they shall see themselves deceived, in the Application of that Principle;

ciple ; and find some things presumed to be only *Inconvenient*, (not proved such by their Author) to appear, and be *unlawful*.

3. *Touching the Imposition of things unlawful.*

In the proposition of this *Case*, we must rather take his meaning than his words. The Question is not of the *Imposition*, but of the *Submission* to unlawful things, if they be imposed. He hath in his former Tract, strongly argued against the *Imposition*, of not only *unlawful* and sinful things, but also of things which he calls *Inexpedient* : And that for this very reason, because they are not lawful, but *sinful*, in worship ; as was shewed in the former case : And any man rational would easily conclude, in this present case, one or both of these two things.

1. That if it be unlawful, to impose things unlawfull or sinful in worship, it is also unlawful to submit unto them in worship, for the same reason.

Or 2. If it be lawful to submit to unlawful or sinful things imposed in Worship, it may be lawful to impose such things in Worship. Yea these two things he hath formerly granted, and asserted. First, That it is utterly unlawful to impose things *Inexpedient*, in Worship, as being sinful there ; and then, that it is as utterly unlawful to submit to sinful things, if imposed, p. 119. And yet now he undertakes a stranger Paradox ; [“ That it may be lawful to submit to things unlawful, even directly sinful against a particular Scripture, not only inconvenient, and unlawful *in genere* :] And the Argument to this purpose, must, I think, be thus framed : [“ It may in some cases be lawful, yea necessary to do things directly forbidden by a special positive Law in Scripture, therefore much rather, if forbidden, only by a general Law.] The *Consequence* at first view, seems reasonable, *a maiore ad minus*. The *Antecedent* he proves from Scripture Instances ; [“ Of the Priests prophaning the Sabbath, and yet innocent.] and the like, of which anon. To the answering whereof, these things may be said, in general.

1. He still takes for granted, both that things *Inexpedient*, are only *Inconvenient*, not sinful in Worship ; and also that such things (as our Ceremonies) are forbidden only by a general Law : when as we have manifested, in the former case ; that they are forbidden

bidden by special Lawes, the second and third Commandments, and 1 Cor. 14. 40, &c.

2. God may dispense with his own Lawes, yea seemingly, and in part *Moral Lawes*; As to the *Israelites* to take the *Goods* of the *Egyptians*, and to *Abraham* to kill his own Son; The reason is, partly his *Sovereignty* over all Creatures, to dispose of them as his own, as he pleases, *Psal.* 50. And partly, and chiefly, because all men are *Delinquents*, guilty of many sins, and *Forfeitures* of all their Enjoyments, and God may justly punish them, with loss of *Goods*, or *Life*; and make what hands he pleases his *Executioners*; as in *Jobs* case: But no power on earth may command, what he forbids; nor forbid, what he commands; and therefore none may *forbear* to do what he commands, though men forbid: nor *submit* to do, what he forbids, though men command.

3. The things instanced in, at least some of them, as the *Priests* killing *Sacrifices*, were never sinful, in the intention of the Law of the *Sabbath*, being Gods works, not our own; but commanded, by a special Law, and so their Duty to do; as being also a part of sanctifying the Day, in that Ceremonial Worship: [“ And in such a case (they “ are the *Casuits* own words) it is not sinful, nor to fulfill a particular Command, but rather a clear Obedience to God, who in “ the instance, takes off the force of the particular, in his more general Law.”] But can he shew us any general or special Law for our unnecessary Ceremonies? If not; what Necessity can make them expedient, lawful, or necessary? But we say, they are *sinful*, and so saies he, by consequence, being so many waies *Inexpedient*, hurtful to the Worship, and Worshippers, as is proved on his former Tract.

4. Those Instances, were only, in cases of *Necessity*, and that also of Gods making, either by his special *Command*, or by a way of *Providence*, casting men into some necessity. [“ And then doubtless (his own words again) the general warrant of the more general Law of Necessity, gave a *Supersedeas* against particular Obligation.”] as will appear upon review of the Particulars: But I pray, what *Necessity* is there for the things in question, either by way of Divine *Command*, or of his *Providence*? What necessity to command them? what to obey them, especially if *Inexpediently* sinful? If there be any, it is of mans making, either on the *Commanders*, whom the R. *Cas.* hath excluded from *Imposing* them: or on the

Submitters part, for fear of punishment, loss of Livings, &c. And if such Necessity may make Submission necessary; the 3 Children, (as called) knew not their Liberty, they might have saved their Lives, by obedience to the Kings Command. I shall put him a Case or two to resolve: There was a particular Law, that a few might eat no *Swines-flesh*; Two Cases of Necessity might happen, to enforce him to eat it; Extremity of *Famine*, or the Command of a *Tyrant*; I suppose the *Casnist* will grant, that it was lawful, yea necessary in the first case to eat it, rather than starve; but not in the second: Or else those Brethren suffered death foolishly, when commanded by the Tyrant to eat it. He may easily understand my meaning, and apply it. I come to his Particulars.

1. That of the *Priests*, is answered already; I only add another Case: Suppose *Saul* had commanded *Butchers*, to kill Beasts on the Sabbath, under some great penalty: Here was his Necessity to do it, or suffer: Let him resolve the Case.

2. It was by a special Law enjoined, that none might eat the *Shew-bread*, but the *Priests*: Suppose again, *Saul* had commanded *David* and his men, (in no necessity of hunger) to eat it, with a sharp penalty upon refusal. Here was his Necessity again: Might they eat it, or not? Yet in a Case of *Providential* Necessity of hunger, they might eat it, and are justified by our *Saviour*. The Reason of this Difference is, because in the one case, *Life* is more necessary to be preserved, than a Ceremonial Command: in the other, *Obedience*, even to a Ceremonial Commandment of God, is more necessary than Life.

3. For *Solomons* Offering upon an Altar not commanded, our Divines give these Answers.

1. That he did it by Divine *Direction*, as he did many other things.

2. That it was in a Case of *Necessity*, in such abundance of Sacrifices: and other the like Reasons. See *D. A. ubi supra. P. 328.* But there is neither *Direction* from God, nor any *Necessity* for our Ceremonies, more, than for many more at *Rome*.

4. *Hezekiahs* admission of the Legally unclean, to the Pasleover, some perhaps will plead *Necessity*; but (under favour) I should rather say, *Hezekiah* did not well: Which appears by Gods striking of the people, which he would not have done, if they had not transgressed some Law; or if *Necessity* would have excused the matter:

Yea

Yea *Hezekiah* had forgotten the Case determined by *Moses*, that if a man were *unclean*, or in a Journey, at the just time of the Passover, he might be excused, if he did observe it, the 14th. day of the next Moneth.

5. *Pauls* Case was this, *Life* is more worth, more necessary than meat, than Corn, in such a Condition.

And therefore his cautelous Distinction, ["betwixt things, that are naturally, internally, materially evil, and such as are unlawful only by some positive Prohibitions in Scripture;"] is here little helpful to him: For we tell him, that the things in question, (some, if not all) are *naturally*, internally evil; and some become *materially* evil, by some evil Circumstance, (if a Prohibition will make a thing materially evil, as he seems to allow) and as against some special Lawes, the Second or Third Commandments, and that special Law of Nature, 1 Cor. 14.40. Which in his own Judgment, is a Law of Nature, which the God of Nature, will not reverse; and so immutably such: Things *Inexpedient* in Worship, though but Inconvenient in *their use*, are as naturally, internally evil, as is any other thing prohibited by a Moral Law; and therefore not to be submitted to, for any external humane Necessity.

That Law of *Indulgence* of God, [*I will have Mercy* (to men or Beasts) *rather than Sacrifice*,] deserves his and our wonder, and astonishment. But little to his present purpose: For it is applicable only in Cases of *emergent* and *Providential* Necessity; and then also, but when compared with *Sacrifice*, [the external and Ceremonial parts of Worship] as himself speaks: *e. gr.* An House is on fire, a Man or Beast is fallen into a Pit, on the *Sabbath day*, in time of publick Worship, in danger to perish: Here God will have *Mercy*, and not *Sacrifice*: as *Paul* left off Preaching, to recover the man fallen down dead. The reason is evident, because to preserve *Life and Goods*, are *Moral* Commandments, and the external *Exercises* of Religion, are, in a kind, *Ceremonial*; And besides, these may be delayed, and made good another time, but the other will perish, if not speedily succoured: ["The positive (sayes he well) must yield to the Natural, and Moral Duty, the less Necessity, to the more necessary, the less to the greater."] But can any external necessity be greater, than that of *Obedience* unto Gods Command, by a *Moral* or *Natural* Law?

His Application therefore, of that Rule of Indulgence, proceeds upon his too common Supposition [“ Is Mercy to our Beast so highly prized, how much more is Mercy to our selves, to our Nation, to the Church, to the soules of our people? &c.] This Inference were good, were the things in question proved to be only *Inconvenient* penally in Worship: but if any of them be proved *unlawful*, and sinful, I should argue to the contrary; [“ Is Mercy to our Beasts, so highly prized, how much more, Mercy to our own soules? Yea “ Mercy to our Nation, Church, People, in avoyding sin against “ God?] whom by sinning, we provoke against all these. This is the way to destroy both *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, and *Priests* also: for *Ministers* to comply together, to offend God: Mercy does well with *Piety*, but without it, is meer Cruelty.

But much stress is laid upon the practise of the *Apostles*, in their condescending to *Conform* in some things, to the Ceremonial Law, and in that *Decree*, Acts 15. To make some things *necessary*, after they were abolished by Christ his Death. This was alledged in the former Case, and here again. For *Pauls* circumcising *Timothy*, and his own Observation of some *Jewish* Rites, when he had preached against them; and that *Decree*, making some Ceremonials, not only lawful and expedient, but *necessary*, many things may be said.

1. Though those Ceremonies were *dead* with Christ, yet at that time they were not *deadly* till they were decently buried; and therefore were then, a while, *Indifferent*, to be used, or not, according to occasion: *Paul*, that circumcised *Tim.* would not circumcise *Titus*, in another case.

2. The reason of both, was one and the same, *viz.* to avoid offence, to the *Jewes*, one while to further their Conversion: to the *Gentiles* another while, to prevent their Apostacy. Now not to lay a *stumbling-Block*, or to remove it, if it be laid, is a *Moral Law*, to which, *Positive*, and Ceremonial Lawes must give place: Even *Ceremonials* of Divine Institution, much more of mens Invention.

3. For that *Decree*, making some things abolished *necessary*; though enough hath been said already; yet I shall consider further what he saith: [“ Things that are expedient, are therefore good, “ (it seemed good to us) and therefore necessary, these necessary “ things: whence those very things, which we are afraid to do, “ because

“because Inexpedient, may possibly, be our Duty to do, because expedient.] By a contrary Inference, things that are *not-expedient* in Worship, are not good (but evil) and therefore unlawful : hence those things, that we do, when expedient, we must be afraid to do, when, and where they are Inexpedient, that is, (in his own Gloss) sinful, in Worship : He addes, p. 147. [“The Apostles knew, that
 “refusing to eat things strangled and bloud, at that time, especially
 “by a Law to enjoin it, was in one Consideration, no small Incon-
 “venience, yea a burden, as they call it, yet to prevent greater In-
 “conveniences, the Apostacy of the *Jews*, the Interruption of the
 “Gospel, &c. it seemed good, yea necessary to them, to do so.] Let the Reader observe here, his old *Diversiō*, (to say no worse) in substituting the Word *Inconvenient* for *Inexpedient* : a penal, for a sinful evil, and confounding the terms : For true it is, those Ceremonial *Observations* (dead before this time) were a *burden*, if Imposed on *Christians*, at that time, but not sinful ; but the causing or occasioning of the *Apostacy* of the Converted *Jews*, or the *Interruption* of their Conversion, by the *Non-observation* of them, for a time, were not only *Inconveniencies* (though such also) but sinful *Inexpediencies*, and therefore enjoined for a time, to prevent very great sins : But I pray, is the *Imposition* of our Ceremonies, and the *submission* to them, for any such ends ? Hear himself speak ; [“The
 “ends moving thereunto, were most weighty, viz. The Unity of
 “Brethren, winning Soules, the Propagation of the Gospel, the
 “prevention of Scandals, and the danger of the Ministry, by per-
 “secution.] Now as for our Ceremonies Imposed, (or the Imposition of things Inexpedient (such as they are) which might equally be justified, upon the same grounds, which yet is by the *R. Cas.* peremptorily denied) not one of these ends can justly be pretended :

1. Not the *Unity* of Brethren ; for they are the greatest Causes of our former, and present Divisions.

2. Not *winning* of Soules : for whom should they win ? *Papists* ? We see the contrary : as some are hardened by our coming so near them ; so some, upon our *Compliance* with them, are turned *Roman Catholikes*.

3. Not the *Propagation* of the Gospel : they hinder it (nothing more) by casting out some Thousands of able *Ministers*, as is reported.

4. Not

4. Not *Prevention* of Scandal; for none that judge them *Matters of Indifferency*, and unnecessary, (as most do, or they are very ill taught) have any just cause to be offended at our *non-observation* of them, while we are perswaded of their unlawfulness: yea they occasion much *Scandal*, to many truly tender Consciences.

5. Not the danger of the *Ministry*, through Persecution; For as that was no End of the *Apostles* making that *Decree*, they being *persecuted*, for not observing them, and preaching against them; so it was the end of the *False Teachers*, *Gal. 6. 12.* who preached up Circumcision, to avoid Persecution: and indeed the *rigorous* praising of them, hath proved the greatest *danger* (I must not say, persecution) of the *Ministry*, since *Q. Mary's* daies: Upon all these Reasons, in my poor Judgment, the *Rev. Casuist*, and his *Prelates*, might have done far more and better Service, to this Church and Nation, if they had endeavoured to procure an *Act*, for *Repealing* of them, than for their *Imposition*, with so much rigour: But whitt.

Lastly, To this Instance, of the *Apostles Decree*, and Practise, I will not plead, the great Distance of the two *Authorities*, then, and now, in imposing things *Indifferent*, or *Inconvenient*, on the Churches: For I foresee, what may be Answered: But I shall only tell him, that very Learned men, are of Opinion, that, that *Decree*, or *Law*, to abstain from things offered to Idols, *strangled*, and *Bloud*, is still obliging to *Christians*: (and then this Instance is impertinent.) For,

1. More may be said to assert their *Obligation*, than for any of ours, or for all the Ceremonies of the *Roman Church*: for this was one of the *Lawes* given to *Noah*, before the *Law*: revived again, by *Moses*, under the *Law*; and now the third time *ratified* under the Gospel: I know nothing so attested, except one day in seven, for a *Sabbath*.

2. The things decreed by the *Apostles*, seem all either equally *necessary*, and perpetual, or all equally *mutable*: *These necessary things*; and if *mutable* and arbitrary, then, *Fornication* may seem now to be, a *venial sin*, as *Papists*; or an *Indifferent thing*, as many Protestants repute it, if we may judge by their Practise; And why things *unequally* lawful, or unlawful, should be included in one *Decree*, I should be glad to see a clear Reason:

3. The reason of their *Prohibition* may seem (for I assert it not) to be *Moral*, and the same in all: As,

1. Things

1. Things *offered to Idols*, the eating of them, especially in the *Idol Temples*, seems to be two waies *Scandalous*, first to the *Idolaters*, to confirm them in their Idolatry, by *Christians* Communion, and communicating with them; and next, to *encourage* weak Christians to do the like, with a doubting Conscience; thus the Apostle argues against it, 1 Cor. 8. 10. Or else, let the *Rev. Cas.* give a Reason, why it is unlawful to be *present* at, and communicate of the *Romish Mass*.

2. The not eating of things *strangled, and blond*, is founded, (say some) upon a *Moral* Reason, because the *Life is in the Bloud*, or is the Bloud, Gen. 9. 4. Lev. 17. 14. and that is perpetually so.

3. As for *Fornication*, that, say most, is prohibited by a *Moral* Law, the Seventh Commandment. Now I shall leave this Case also, with the *Rev. Casuist*, to be resolved, at his leisure. However, in the *Interim*, I shall say, these two things.

1. That in some Cases, those things (besides Fornication) are still obliging, as to abstain from eating things *offered to Idols*, in their *Temples*, if a *Christian* should live amongst them, for the Reasons given above: and to abstain from things *strangled, and blond*, if the *Jewes* lived with us, if it might further their *Conversion*.

2. That our *Case* is not the same with theirs. For we abstain not from things *meerly Indifferent, or Inconvenient*, but from things (in our Judgment, and his also) *Inexpedient*, that is *sinful* in their use, in *Worship*.

I shall not need now, to say any thing, to the Testimonies of *Calvin, Pet. Martyr, or Zanchy*; they are all satisfied, by what is said: and I hasten to conclude this Case: I hope the *Rev. Cas.* will now find his *Scriptures* answered better, and himself better *resolved*, by his own Principles; as my self, and I believe many others, are more *confirmed* in our Inconformity, by a *prudent and serious* pondering of the Premises, lent us, by himself.

3. Concerning the making of the first Declaration.

In managing the whole Discourse of the *Grand Case* of Conformity, the *Rev. Author*, deals not so fairly and fully, as was expected, nor (under Favour) so *ingeniously*, as is desired: For he carries on the Business so *precariously, so limitedly*, as if he cared not, or intended not to satisfy all his *Readers*, but to *move* the main part.

part of his work, or leave it half undone: as may thus appear.

Pag .2,4,12.

1. He professes, that he treats only with such, as could *conform*, were it not for one, or both the Declarations, which I believe (for I have spoken with divers of them) not one of a hundred of Non-conformers, would have done. And he speaks not one word to satisfy those, who have other Reasons for their Inconformity.

2. He professes also, that he takes for *granted*, that the Government, Liturgy and Ceremonies of the Church, are all good, and lawful, (waving the *Necessity* of them) and esteemed such by them, that refuse conformity, p. 138. ["I confess I took the lawfulness of these, in themselves, for granted."] When as he knowes, they have all been *controverted*, more or less, well nigh these last hundred years, and are yet *sub judice*.

3. As in his former Cases, so here, all along, he takes also for granted, both that *Inconvenient* and *Inexpedient* are both one, and also, that the *Ceremonies*, and other things controverted, are but inconvenient, and not *sinful*: Now it is an easie thing, to make and resolve any Cases, if a man may have liberty to *suppose* what he pleases, to build (as a Foundation) his *Resolutions* upon: And if he will give me the like liberty, to suppose all those three named to be *unlawful*, or but to have something in them, *untrue*, or *unlawful*, how easily can I dissolve all his Resolutions, and *resolve* and determine the contrary to his Opinion. And this *Advantage* we have on our side, that as he (I say not, cannot) hath not proved all things in them *lawful*, so if but one *Particular* in each of them, yea in the *whole Book*, as now established, be either *untrue*, or *unlawful*, no conscientious man can make those *Declarations*, without palpable *Dissimulation*, if not something worse. Had the *Rev. Cas.* taken but half so much paines to prove them, and all things in them, to be *true*, and *lawful*, as he hath to perswade us to conform, by *supposing* them lawful; he might have had more *Profelytes*, than now he can expect: But I attend his motion.

His first *Case*, with the *Resolution* thereof, concernes not those at all, that go upon other grounds, for their *Inconformity*. For as some of them, never made the former *Subscription*, nor took any *Oath* to the *Ordinary*; so others of them, have (seeing just cause, as they believe) *repented* of their *rash* undertakings in their younger years, through

through *Ignorance*, and inconsideration. And as the *Objections* by him started, are not by these *owned*; so nor do they think, the *Solutions* by him given, will be satisfactory, to those, for whom they are intended.

For the first Objection, that though they could *read* the Expressions, yet they do not so *heartily* like and approve them, as seems to be required; he resolves it thus [“ The Object of your assent, and consent, is not the words, but things; not every word, but every thing, &c.] A poor elusion, or rather delusion of his Readers; For as the things are expressed in the words; so the *very words*, (for it was solicitously worded) are a part of the all, and every thing contained in the Book; from which if a man should vary, to use his own apprehensions, and expressions, he should quickly hear of it, (as is said) with both his eares. And to say, we cannot *heartily* like, and approve them, as seems required, and yet to give an *unfeigned Assent*, and *Consent* to all and every thing therein, seems to me (I say not *Hypocrisie*) a contradiction: as I say; [“ I cannot heartily approve them, and yet I do heartily approve them.] For what is done *unfeignedly*, is, I take it, done *heartily*, *ex animo*.

His Distinction, of absolute, and comparative *approbation*, applied to the Second Objection; will hardly please any Party:

1. Not the *Nonconformers*; for if their ground of *refusal* be good, *viz.* the *unlawfulness* of but one thing therein, they can neither absolutely nor comparatively assent and consent thereunto: A comparative *Approbation* of a sinful thing, is it self sinful.

2. Not those he intends to persuade; for an *unfeigned* assent, to the *Truth*, and Consent to the *Goodness*, of all, and every thing in that *Book*; is as full and *absolute* an *Approbation* (in their apprehension) as can be given to the *Book* of God, the *Holy Scripture* it self.

3. Not to the Bishops or *Prelates*; for it is supposed, that their *design*, in procuring and promoting the Act, was to get the *Assent* and *Consent*, and that *unfeigned*, of all the *Clergy*; that is their *Approbation* of the *Truth*, and *Goodness*, of all and every thing in the *Books* of *Prayer* and *Ordination*; of their *Order* of *Episcopacy*, above *Presbyters*, &c. which was formerly attempted (but miscarried) in the *& cetera Oath*: And to say, [“ you do not absolutely approve of every thing in the Book, as that you would chuse above all, and as best in it self,] as it will hardly please them, so it seems to put

a *surge*, as upon the *Book*, as not the best (which yet was requisite in the publick Worship of God) so upon the Composers of it, as if something in it, were scarcely true, or good; but at least, very *Inconvenient*, and to be yielded to, only *comparatively*, to prevent some greater *Inconveniencies*, all which, if they pleased, they could have removed.

Lastly, It will hardly satisfy the *Imposers*, whose Design is supposed to be, *Unanimity*, as well as *Uniformity*; a full and unfeigned *Approbation*, of all, and every thing, contained in that *Bulk*, or *Body* of Religion, as now it is come forth, and established: for they three or four times (besides this Declaration) require, in the Act, an *Approbation* of all and every thing; as if they intended to explain, what they mean, by ["those milder words of Assent, "and Consent,] as the *R. Casuist* calls them, p. 8. viz. a full *Approbation* of all.

But he addes: ["Had the word *free* been in the Act, in stead of "unfeigned (as some male-contentis out of a vile Design, do buzze up "and down) there had been more colour of the former Objection.]"

To let pass the *harshness* of his words, in this *Paragraph*, the rather, because he hath been so *modest* and moderate, in his former Cases: To the rest I should say: Is not *unfeigned*, as much, or rather more, than *free*? Surely what I *unfeignedly* assent to, as true, and consent *unfeignedly* to, as good and lawful, I do it *freely*, or grossely dissemble. And may we not *freely chuse* things that we believe are true, and good, for themselves, and of our own accord? I believe many do so: *Assent* and *Consent* to all and every thing as *freely*, as *unfeignedly*, and desire no other, no *better*, as thinking these the best. And I suppose, the *Composers*, if not the *Imposers*, expect this free choyce, and will hardly thank them that do it, for other Reasons; as no *sure friends* to their Cause.

But the last Answer will ["perfectly remove any such scruple for "ever: Let the Act interpret it self: The words foregoing are "these: Every Minister shall declare his unfeigned Assent, and "Consent to the use of all things, in the said Book, &c. not simply, "to all things but to all things with respect to their use, to the use of "all things in the said Book.] As fine and nice a *Cobweb Lawn*, as can be spun; but transparent, and fit only to catch *weaker flies*, but easily broken by the stronger. For.

1. He told us before, p. 7. ["the Object of our Assent, was not words, but things, not every word, but every thing.] Now *Assent*, (as was said long ago) is an Act of the *Understanding*, whose Object is *Truth*: *Consent* is an Act of the *Will*, whose Object is *Goodness*; If then, I assent and consent to all and every thing contained in that Book; do I not simply assent, and consent to all things in it, as true, and good?

2. Can any *Conscientious* man, assent, and consent to the *use* of all and every thing in the *Book*, unless he be first convinced of the *Truth* and *Goodness*, of all, and every thing to be used? And if the use had been intended only, in this first *Declaration*, it was superfluous to put it again, in the second.

3. The *Intention* of the *Imposers*, may be collected rather from the *Declaration* it self, than from the foregoing words, ["They shall declare their Assent, and Consent, to the use of all, in this manner, by declaring their Assent and Consent to all, and every thing in the *Book*.] their *uniformity* in practise, by their *unanimity* in Judgment: For this in reason must be supposed, or they could not in any reason require the other, to make men practise against their judgment. And if this was not their design, why did they so suddenly change the expression, first to *the use*, and now to all and every thing?

4. And why do they afterwards, so often use those words, He shall declare his *Approbation*, his *Approbation* of all, &c. which must be meant of the *Truth* and *Goodness* of all, as well as of the use.

Lastly, this nice distinction of *use* and *things*, cannot be applied to all, and every thing, in this first *Declaration*: For, every Minister, though he assent and consent to the *use* of all in the *Book* of *Common-Prayer*, yet he cannot properly assent and consent to the use of all and every thing contained in the *Book* of *Ordination*: for no Minister under a *Bishop*, can Ordain a *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*: It must then necessarily be taken, for their Assent and Consent to the *Truth* and *Goodness* of the *Way of Ordination* by *Bishops*, and of the three *Orders* of Church Officers, &c. And thus much of the first *Declaration*.

4. Concerning the making of the Second Declaration.

In the *Subscription*, or second *Declaration*, there are three main things that fall into consideration.

[" 1. The taking up Armes against the King.

" 2. Conformity to the Liturgy.

" 3. The Solemn League and Covenant.]

Of which, we know not what is best, and safest, whether to *Speak*, or be *silent*: If we *Speak* not very warily, we run upon a rock of Law; if *silent*, we may be suspected, to betray our own *Innocence*: To the two first, we shall say very little, to the last a little more.

1. To the first, we humbly crave leave to say this little: They that refuse to make this *Declaration*, do not stick at this, but are ready to profess [" That as they never did take up Arms against the King (which was constantly denied by the Parliament, in all their Declarations, and Protestations, and they think, in the Covenant it self) but for the King. So they hold it utterly unlawful, for Subjects, so to do.] and hold it (as now by Law it is determined) a *Trayterous Position*, so to assert; which they were taught before to *abhor*, both by *Scripture*, by the *Oathes* of Allegiance and Supremacy, and by the *Solemn Covenant* it self.

2. The second of *Conforming* to the Practice of the Liturgy, as little is said here by the *Casnist*; so it is sufficiently discussed and resolved, according to the judgment of Non-conformists, in the former Case: The Result whereof is this: [" If there be any thing, any one thing in it, either untrue, or unlawful, they dare not declare their unfeigned Assent, and Consent to it, or the practice of it.]

3. That of the Covenant is the *Mountain* to be removed, not by the *Faith*, but by the *strength* and *skill* of the Learned *Casnist*: And this is acknowledged by the *Refusers* of this Declaration, to be the main *Business* of contest: and that, not in the *whole*, but in one particle thereof, in the second *Article*: as will appear.

In three things, the *Rev. Casnist*, and they, are fully agreed.

[" 1. That a Covenant both illegally Imposed, and illegally taken, may bind the Takers.] That must be (I suppose) from the, either necessity, or lawfulness of the matter covenanted.

[" 2. That the Covenant in question, doth not bind to an endeavour to alter, or meddle with the State-Government.] No, for it is as strong an establishment of it, as can be made, in the third *Article*.

[" 3. That if the Alteration or Exirpation of Church-Government, be the main Business of the Covenant, and this be lawful
"it

“it doth so far bind the takers: if not lawful, they are so far discharged from the Obligation of it.] Now evident it is, that the *Anti-Covenanters*, as they do not except against any *Article* of it, but the *Second*; so nor against any part or particle of this second *Article*, but only this, [“ That *Covenants* to endeavour the extirpation of Prelacy, that is the Hierarchy, &c.] This, this is the *Helena*, for which they contend so vigorously: This the *eye-sore*, that so exasperates their *Spirits*. They do not, I think, they dare not deny the Obligation, of the other *Articles*, nor of the other parts of the second, [“ as to the extirpation of Popery, Superstition, Heresie, Schism, Prophaness, &c.] Much less will they deny the Obligation of the third *Article*, [“ to defend and preserve the Kings Majesties Person, and Authority, the Rights and Privileges of Parliament, &c.] They may say, they were bound to those, either by the *Oaths* of Allegiance and Supremacy, or by the Law of *Nature*, as Native Subjects: I answer,

1. How many took the *Covenant*, that never took those *Oaths*?

2. The other is true, but then it must be granted, that the *Covenant*, though illegally imposed, and taken, (the matter being necessary, or lawful) adds a new *Obligation*, being made to *God* only: And as the latter does not void the former, so the former does not disoblige from the latter.

This Oath was made, at least in this Article, to God only, P. 114.

3. I add, we were bound (before the *Covenant* was imposed or taken) by the *Law of Nature*, and our *Covenant* of Baptism, and *Scripture-Rules*, [“ to endeavour the Reformation of Religion, in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, in our places, and Callings, and consequently to extirpate Popery, Superstition, &c.] though we had never taken the *Covenant*: Hence I would infer, (supposing, for *Disputations* sake, not positively asserting it,) [“ If the Episcopal Government, as then it stood, be equally unlawful, with Popery, Superstition, and the rest: we are by a former Obligation to God, bound equally to endeavour the alteration, and extirpation of it;] and the *Covenant* is but a new *Cord*, added to strengthen that Obligation. *Hic labor, hoc opus*.

I know it is not safe for any wise man, to say much, in Defence of the *Covenant*, there being an *Act* published to dissolve, and annul it, as unlawful, in several respects: I shall therefore assert nothing positively for it, or against the present *Church-Government*; but humbly crave leave, to proceed suppositively, as the *Rev. Cas.* does:

For

For all his large *Discourse*, to perswade to that part of the second *Declaration*, is founded upon this Supposition; not that the Government is *Jure Divino*, and so necessary, (for upon supposal of that, a *Covenant*, or *endeavour* to alter or extirpate it, were utterly unlawful :) but only *Lawful* or *Indifferent*: And then, I should, for my part, grant, that it was *unlawful* to *Covenant*, much more to *endeavour* to alter and *extirpate* it, without the Supream Authority of the Nation: And let me but have the like liberty, to *suppose*, (let others that can, make it good) that the *Government*, is, by the Word of God, *unlawful*; and upon that *Supposition* and *Perswasion*, as I may not own it, by *Assent*, *Consent*, or *Subscription*, so all his Arguments, to prove the *Lawfulness* of making this Declaration, are to me, of no force; till he prove it, either *necessary*, or at least *Lawful* (which he goes not about to do, but all along takes for granted, which, I think, he ought not to do) for *their sakes*, who scruple the *Lawfulness* of it.

That he does *suppose* the *Lawfulness*, (for he *waves* to plead the *Necessity* of this Government, as others begin to do, both in the former, and in these Cases) appears in several passages: ["as p. 25. s. 10. and p. 52. Admit that Episcopal Government was *Res Indifferens, & Mutabilis*, when sworn against, p. 80. If the Government sworn against, be not unlawful. And p. 138. I confess "I took the *Lawfulness* of the Government, &c. in themselves, "for granted."] Importing (as I think) if the things were unlawful, then the fault of the *Covenant* was not in the *Matter* (it might be lawful to covenant, and endeavour the extirpation of them) but in the *Manner*, that it was *illegally* imposed, and taken, without the King, &c. And now I shall see him state the Question.

It seemes, some *Covenanters* granting, that if the *Matter* of the *Covenant*, was but in this Particular unlawful, the *Covenant* it self, was so far unlawful, and lost its Obligation; do call aloud for strong Reasons, to prove the *unlawfulness* of the *Matter*, in this particular: The Learned *Casnist* now undertakes to give such as he hath; but (under favour) quite besides the Question by them intended: For they suppose, not only the *Government* to be unlawful, but also the *Extirpation* of it (which is the *Matter* now in question) to be lawful: and require Reasons to prove it materially unlawful. But his Case, and Reasons respect the *Takers*, whether they may *Covenant* and endeavour to extirpate the Government, without the King:
for

for so he saies: [*My work is, in short, to prove, that the Covenant, so far as it engageth the Takers of it, against Church-Government, and for the change of it, is unlawful, and sinful, in the Matter of it.*] The *Matter* is one thing; whether it be lawful (for any) to extirpate the *Government* (supposed unlawful:) The *Takers* are another; whether it be lawful for *private* men, to undertake this, without the King: The former may be lawful, when the latter is not so: And here he slides secretly from the *Matter* to the Manner; from the *Thing* to the *Persons*; as will appear.

For mark his Distinction, whereon, he sayes, he *fixes* the foot of all the Arguments following: [*"The things sworn to be done, may be either such, as is simply unlawful for any to do, or quoad nos, when though not sinful in the first Consideration; yet to such persons it is sinful.*] Mark this, it is in true sense, as if he had said, The *Matter* may be lawful and laudable in it self, and lawful to be done, but not *lawfully* (for *Manner*) by some Persons: For instance; The *Government*, being not *necessary*, but *Indifferent* and mutable, may lawfully be altered, yea *extirpated*, by the *King* and *Parliament*; but not by single or private persons: (*I doubt his Superiours will give him little thanks for this Intimation.*)

But now see, how he applies this Distinction; [*"If the Extirpation of the Government, be unlawful, either in the first or absolute sense, or else as to those, that did thus covenant; if either way, it be found unlawful, so far the Covenant is sinful in the very Matter of it.*] This is strange from so Learned a *Casnist*: For if it be *absolutely* unlawful to extirpate the Government, then it is unlawful to Covenant so to do; but if it be unlawful only as to such persons, will your Learning suffer you to assert, it is sinful in the very *Matter* of it? And is there not another way, granted by your self, to free the *Matter* from fault? You may please to review, how you secretly beg the Question, that it is simply unlawful to extirpate the *Government*, which you cannot say unless you make it *necessary*, *Jure Divino*, (which you have twice *waved* to do.) And if it be only *lawful*, and not *necessary*, (as you seem to be of opinion) you will not deny (unless you deny a *Priviledge* of Parliament) but it is *mutable*, and may be altered by a Lawful Authority: much more if it be it self unlawful: And if so; then the *Matter* of the Covenant, is not sinful; but the *Crime* will fall only on the *Takers*, which respects the manner. But on the other side; If it be in it self

self *unlawful*, the extirpation of it, is also *lawful*, and the Covenanting to endeavour it, even by private persons, may be *materially* lawful, by former Obligations to God. Or let him give us a solid Reason, why the *Covenant* shall bind us, to extirpate *Poperie*, *Superstition*, &c. And in the same *Article*, shall not oblige us, to extirpate an *unlawful Government*, I mean, supposing it to be such.

There are therefore no small misadventures in his Ninth *Paragraph*, p. 25. As,

1. That the immediate Question, and that which most nearly concerns the Covenanters, is not, whether the thing sworn be in it self lawful, but whether it be so to them?] But by his favour, the first Question concerns them most: for if the thing sworn be *unlawful* in it self, it renders it *ipso Facto* unlawful for them to swear: But if the thing be lawful in it self, yea necessary for some to do, yet it may not be lawful for them to undertake it; as he told us, a little before.

2. If the thing be *materially* lawful, and more, if it be necessary for all to do, in their *places* and callings, there lies no guilt upon them, [first to purpose, and then to swear to do their Duty;] that is, to do that which God hath some way or other commanded them to do.

3. It is not reasonable to say. [As it is unlawful for us, it goes into the matter of the Covenant which we take.] For the *Matter* may be lawful, as to execute *Justice*, &c. and yet unlawful for private persons. And then the *Consequence*, which he would infer hence, is inconsequent. [That that which is unlawful to us, if sworn, doth make that Oath, as ours, unlawful in it self, that is, in the Matter of it.] It makes the *Oath* unlawful indeed, but not in the *Matter*, which may in it self be lawful, but in the *Manner*, as ours.

The prime and main Question then, should have been, [Whether the Government covenanted against, be necessary, lawful, or unlawful?] All which, he *industriously* waves to resolve: for so he saies, [I shall not need to dispute, whether the Government of our Church be so necessary by a *Jus Divinum*, as that it is unalterable by men: or that it is sinful in it self, to endeavour the alteration of it, p. 25.] Truly, I believe, he answers not the expectation or desires of some of his own Party, that he does not undertake this *Task*. And I can assure him, that if he had proved that

that by two or three strong Arguments, his Non-conforming Brethren, would have much thanked him, and ingenuously have confessed, the Covenant in the *Matter* of it was unlawful: But why would he not for *their sakes*, give some solid *Reasons*, to prove the *Government* lawful? And then perhaps, they would have yielded, the Covenant to be unlawful in the *manner*, if not also, so far in the *Matter*. It were no hard work, to conjecture, why he chose rather to prove the *Covenant* to be unlawful, with respect to the *Persons*, that imposed, and took it; and took it for granted, the *Government* was, and is in it self lawful. But I shall forbear to express my thoughts. I shall tell him what I observed on his former *Cases*, that he did not in *Hypothesis*, take upon him to vindicate our *Ceremonies*, but kept aloof in *Thesis*, in *Indifferent*, and *Inexpedient* things (which yet he could not do, but he must *suppose*, for Disputes sake, the *Ceremonies* were such things, though he instanced not in any of them) because it was both *hard* to *prove* them lawful; and unsafe or dangerous, to *insinuate* they were unlawful: I say no more.

But now, seeing he knowes, that the Governments *Lawfulness*, hath been long controverted at home and abroad, by very Learned and Pious men, and Churches: I should think, it had been *reasonable* and expedient, in this so great an undertaking, as to perswade *Dissemblers* to Conformity, not to *presume*, and take for granted, the things are lawful, but by some *irrefragable* Arguments, though few, to prove that they are so: Or else to give them liberty to produce theirs, to prove them unlawful; which is not safe for either Party: Yet to suppose a while, and for Disputations sake, to take them (the Government in special) to be unlawful; and then, thereby to manifest how weak, and *unsatisfying*, all his Reasonings are, to such as take them so to be: This one Answer may be an impenetrable shield, ["The Government is to us unlawful; and therefore we cannot, we dare not assent, consent, or subscribe unto it."]

To follow the Rev. Author, in all his Particulars, would be both *dangerous*, and *tedious*, when one Answer must so often be repeated, which may serve once for all, *It is to us unlawful*.

For hence, 1. It matters not at all ["Whether the Covenant in this part (or others) was imposed, and taken, by a Body in Parliament, or by Single persons, or by the King himself without them."] For the thing it self being *unlawful*, they were bound, without any Covenant taken (but more with it) to alter, and endeavour to extirpate it, every one in his *Place*, and *Calling*. A necessary

cessary Duty, concerning all persons, more, or less ; as it may and must be done, by every one *single* (I say still, in his Place and Calling) so it may be covenanted to be endeavoured, by one or more together. This is Asserted by a Learned *Episcopal Doctor* [“ That
“ to fulfil the expresse Commandment of God, no man doubteth,
“ but that a *Covenant* may be made, not only without, but against
“ the Command of a Prince.]

2. If the thing be in it self *unlawful*, then to Covenant to endeavour (each in his Place and Calling) to extirpate a sinful Government, is not against, [“ 1. The Kings Rights, either as Supreme Governour, or as Legislator. 2. Nor against the Lawes of the
“ Land. 3. Nor against the Priviledges of Parliament. 4. Nor against
“ the liberties of the subjects. 5. Nor against any former obligations.]

God hath the first *Obligation* upon us, by our *Baptism*, and Christian Profession (I say still, each in his Place and Calling.) [“ To contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints, Jude v. 3.] And consequently to endeavour to remove and root out, all *Doctrine*, Worship, Discipline, or Government contrary thereunto: I shall not so much distrust the *Understanding* of any Reader ; much less the *Judgment* of the Learned *Casuis*t, as that they will deny the former *Consequences* (upon my borrowed, or begged Supposition) or that they are not easily able, if but willing, to make *Application* thereof, to all the Particulars named.

Much more might have been said, to many things, but I am warned by anothers Harm, [“ Not to fly too near the Candle, lest
“ I be scorched by the Flame.]

5. The Conclusion.

Concerning the Lawfulness of Re-Ordination, &c.

There is one thing (and but one thing, he saies) more, in the Condition of *Law*, required of Ministers, by the Act, and that is, [“ Re-Ordination of such, as were Ordained by Presbyters only,
“ and Ordination of others, by Bishops.] And both these are much scrupled by some, men of hopeful, and very useful parts : The latter sort, because they believing Bishops, as such, and as a distinct Order from Presbyters, to be unlawful, dare not come under unauthorized hands : The former, because they judge their Ordination valid, by Presbyters ; and dare no more be re-ordained, then re-baptized. And indeed, if their Ordination by Presbyters, be invalid, all their Ministerial Acts, by vertue of that Ordination, are null, (as some Prelates have told them :) and if not they themselves, yet

yet those baptized by them, must be re-baptized, or else they are scarce Christians: which seems very harsh Doctrine, from them, who as thy cry out of Anabaptists, for Re-baptization; so in some Cases, allow a Woman to baptize: Let them consider it: and I attend him. He uses many Reasons, to perswade the first sort (though nothing to the second) not to stick at Re-ordination. As,

[“ 1. Considering, that Liberty is not denied them, to keep their own sense, whether Ordination by Presbyters, is valid, or not.”] This is, as if the Children of Anabaptists, being forced by Law, to be baptized, should perswade their Parents to suffer it, considering that Liberty is not denied them, to keep their own sense, whether this Baptism is valid, or not: and they may rebaptize them, when at Age. Does an Ordinance of God, depend upon mens sense thereof? Or may men dally with it in this manner? and not take his Name in vain? However, some Bishops tell them, their first Ordination, with all the Acts thereof are null, and bid them repent of all. Now if their Ordination be judged by them, to be valid, they in repeating of it, offend against the Word, the Ordainers, and those Churches that have no Bishops, as making theirs, no Ministers, no Churches. If they judge it not valid, they offend (if but ignorantly) against the *Institution* of Christ; who hath placed Ordination in a Presbytery. Bishops themselves being first Ordained by such, (even B. *Timothy*, if a B. he was) as *Hierome* (with the Scripture) hath proved, and others follow him herein.

[“ 2. The Act (he saies) makes it self no judge of the Ordination by Presbyters, in forreign Churches.”] In words, and directly it does not; but implicitly, and consequentially it does; Else, why doth it so strictly, so rigorously, require Ordination by a Bishop? But as making the former null, and invalid, to any Ministerial Acts? Yea some Prelatical men, stick not to affirm those Churches to be none, that want Bishops.

[“ 3. There is no other way (saies he) to exercise their Ministry, in this Church, by Law, or to entitle them to a Charge, or the Profits thereof.”] How true this is, appears, in that many Priests, ordained by Popish Bishops, are admitted to all those, without Re-ordination. It is a sad thing, that a Presbytery of pious, Learned, Orthodox men, should not find the same favour with Protestants. But if Ordination by Presbyters, be Evangelical, it should seem reasonable, it should be made Legal: No Law of

man ought to countermand the Institutions of Jesus Christ. And what is this, but a kind of Independant Principle, on the one side, who allow and require Re-ordination of their Ministers (such as it is) as oft as they remove from one congregation to another: And on the other side, a kind of Anabaptistical Fancy, & practise, who allow, & require rebaptization of those baptized by our episcopal Ministers. And lastly it seems a too near Compliance with *Rome*; where they re-ordain those of ours, that convert, or apostate to them, though ordained by our Bishops, as our Bishops re-ordain those ordained by Presbyters. This Retaliation may seem just, and reasonable, at least from God.

4. To save himself a further Labour, he refers us to Mr. *Humphries* Justification of his own, and others Re-ordination: *Alas poor Soul?* A worse Perswasive could scarce have been brought: whose Tracts are judged by some very weak, and by others sufficiently confuted; and which is more, strongly, really contradicted, by a most vehement Abjuration, of his 2^d Ordination by a Bishop.

Concerning his own solemn Profession and Subscription, *ex animo*, ["That he hath not used one Argument, but what he judges "convincing, &c."] I, for my part, am in Charity bound, and willing to believe him: For upon his *Supposition*, I should easily be convinced my self; that is, ["if the Government, Liturgy, Ceremonies "of this Church, be in all, and every thing, true and lawful,] (which are indeed all concerned, and supposed in the Declarations, but not by him at all proved, but confessedly here, taken for granted) I should be ready to profess Conformity to them; notwithstanding many *Inconveniences* in them: But when his Opposites take many things to be unlawful, and he presumes to take them all for lawful; he may perhaps persuade some, that are of his mind, (which few are) but cannot in reason hope to make them his Proselytes, who judge any thing in them, unlawful.

There are some other things here repeated, which have been spoken to elsewhere, and I pass them by. I have one humble request to make to the Rev. Casuist; and I have done: That at his next leisure, he will be pleased to give some few new Arguments, (for the old, we think, are insufficient, and sufficiently answered) to prove, I say not all and every thing in the Declarations to be necessary (that would be too hard a Task) but to prove, the things controverted, the Government, Liturgie, Ceremonies to be Lawful, according to the Word of God; and I shall engage my self, and what little Credit I have, either to give him a fair, and full Answer, with Meekness, and Modesty; or, if I cannot, to yield my self his Proselyte.

FINIS.

